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The purpose of this study is to compare the relative ability of Congress and the Presidency to reflect the public will. It takes as its point of departure the long standing argument that either the Presidency, on the one hand, or the Congress, on the other, is the superior institution for popular representation.

A correlation design was devised in which Congress and the Presidency were compared according to their relative agreement or disagreement with the majority position of public opinion polls, on a range of issues over which Congress and the Presidency disagreed, in the period 1947 through 1969.

Over the whole series of issues, the Presidency was found to reflect public opinion more often than Congress by a significant margin. Differences were also found in the degree to which Congress or the Presidency reflected public opinion in reference to (1) particular issue areas, and (2) sizes of opinion poll majority.

The results suggest that the relationship between Congress and the Presidency, and the majority of public opinion is more complex than conventional arguments indicate, and varies according to issue area and size of majority opinion.

It is suggested that efforts for congressional and presidential reform take into account the finding that Congress consistently thwarts the public will in specific issue areas.
CONGRESS, PRESIDENTS, AND PUBLIC OPINION:
A STUDY OF CONGRESSIONAL-PRESIDENTIAL DISAGREEMENTS
CORRELATED WITH THE MAJORITIES OF NATIONAL
PUBLIC OPINION POLLS, 1947-1969
INTRODUCTION

Between 1947 and 1969, slightly over half of presidential requests for congressional legislation were denied by Congress (v. Figure 1). Assuming that the majority of public opinion agrees with either Congress or the Presidency when the latter two disagree, it follows that (1) either Congress or the Presidency opposes the public will equally as often, or (2) either Congress or the Presidency opposes the public will more often than not. If national public opinion polls substantiate

1 Approximately 53% of presidential requests for congressional legislation were denied by Congress between 1947 and 1969.

"Only specific requests for legislative action submitted to Congress by the President were tabulated for the Boxscore. Excluded from the list of legislative requests were proposals advocated by officials of the Executive Branch, but not specifically by the President; measures that the President endorsed but did not request; suggestions that Congress consider or study particular topics, if no legislative action was requested; nominations.

"Almost all appropriation requests were excluded because they are a yearly occurrence and provide the funds necessary to carry out regular functions of the Government. But CQ, included several appropriate requests the President designed at key points of certain programs, and which were submitted in special messages.

"The number of requests is a fair, but necessarily somewhat arbitrary, count of the Presidential proposals. Requests can be totaled in many ways. Though not all the President's proposals were equally important, CQ makes no attempt to weigh them. But a rough, automatic weighting results from major requests usually having several points.

"Congress does not always vote "yes" or "no" on a Presidential proposal. CQ evaluates compromise to determine if the request is closer to approval or to rejection of the President's request."
Figure 1. Presidential Requests and Congressional Approvals, 1947-1969

(Source: "Presidential Boxscore," Congressional Quarterly Almanac)

Number of Presidential Requests

Scale:
1 vertical square = 25 presidential requests
1 horizontal square = 1 year

% Approved

Discontinuity result of changing method of tabulating legislative requests, 1953-1954.

- Presidents: Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon

- Presidential Requests
- Congressional Approvals
that identifiable majorities of public opinion exist on enough public issues, it should be possible to determine whether Congress or the Presidency better implements the fundamental democratic principle of majority rule. 2

The central question considered by this study is whether Congress or the Presidency agrees more often with the majority of public opinion. The question is important, for it is closely associated with determining the need for congressional and presidential reform. If it can be shown that Presidents are more often in agreement with public opinion

---

than Congress, then proponents of increased executive power may find support for their argument that presidential power should be expanded at the expense of an unresponsive Congress. Similarly, advocates of congressional reform may argue that the same findings indicated a need for making Congress more responsive to popular opinion, while maintaining a more nearly equal division of power between the legislative and executive branches. In the absence of empirical inquiry, such arguments are impressionistic and weak at best. The purpose of this study is to provide the data necessary to illuminate the more general controversy of congressional and presidential reform.

In the next chapter, the literature of political science will be surveyed as it applies to the question of whether Congress or the Presidency agrees more often with the majority of public opinion.

---

3 v. Davidson, Kovenock, and O'Leary, op. cit., pp. 24 and 30 for a discussion of reform propositions under the "executive-force" and "literary" theories.
CHAPTER I
RESUME OF RELATED PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE

One long-standing concern of American political science is the description of the representative roles of Congress and the Presidency. The relative powers and strengths of these institutions to represent the public will usually have been treated in political science in one of two contexts. Either writers have viewed the historical trends of Congress and the Presidency, or they have intuitively ascribed the predominance of one institution over the other. The aim of this thesis is to compare systematically the public records of Congress and the Presidency with available expressions of public opinion, in order to provide an empirical base for the contention that one or the other actually represents the public more accurately.

Chapter I surveys the literature of the field as it applies to the question at hand. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first outlines the basic dialogue in the early literature of modern politics concerning the appropriate role of representative institutions. The second presents two modern theories of representation which alternately present Congress, or the Presidency, as being the principal institution of representation in American democracy. The third offers an explanation of the way this research contributes to the existing literature of the field.
THE ROLE OF THE REPRESENTATIVE

The literature of eighteenth century political philosophy contains two divergent views of the appropriate role of representatives and representative institutions. One is found in the works of Edmund Burke. Burke argues that representatives ought not necessarily reflect public opinion, though it be given serious consideration. Rather, the representative should act as trustee of the public welfare, representing according to his own best judgment the interests of the public he serves, as he interprets those interests.

For the follower of Burke, who may be called an "elitist," the findings of this thesis are not important, for he would not concern himself with the extent to which either Congress or the Presidency might reflect directly the expressed will of the public. On the other hand, the literature of this topic also offers the "republican" view which does consider the question of representatives reflecting the public will as important.

The republican view is best developed in the works of Jean Jacques Rousseau and Thomas Jefferson. They argue that the appropriate role of the representative is that of delegate, rather than trustee. The

4 "Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion." Edmund Burke to his Bristol constituents, 3 November 1774 as appears in John M. Swarthout and Ernest R. Bartley (eds.), Materials on American National Government (New York: Oxford University Press, 1952), p. 254.
delegate always acts, to the best of his ability, as the servant of public opinion, reflecting the predilections of the majorities of public opinion. 5

Throughout the nineteenth century, the controversy over the role of the representative continued. Both Alexis de Tocqueville and James

5"As Rousseau convincingly proved, sovereignty is the one attribute that by its nature cannot be delegated: to delegate is equivalent to giving it up. And it is a contradiction in terms to think of particular wills substituting for the general will." James Burnham, Congress and the American Tradition (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1959), p. 292.

"Each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will..."

"There is often a great deal of difference between the will of all and the general will, the latter considers only the common interest, while the former takes private interest into account, and is no more than the sum of particular wills: but take away from these same wills the pluses and minuses that cancel one another, and the general will remains as the sum of the differences." Jean Jacques Rousseau, The Social Contract (1762, trans. G.D.H. Cole, E. P. Dutton & Company, 1947), cited by William Ebenstein (ed.), Great Political Thinkers (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), pp. 445, 449.

"...[A]bsolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, — the vital principle of republics, from which there is not appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism;..." Thomas Jefferson, First Inaugural, 4 March 1801, Saul K. Padover (ed.), Thomas Jefferson on Democracy (New York: Mentor, 1958), p. 32.

"The first principle of republicanism is, the lex-majoris partis (the law of the majority) is the fundamental law of every society of individuals of equal rights; to consider the will of the society enounced by the majority of a single vote, as sacred as if unanimous, is the first of all lessons in importance, yet the last which is thoroughly learnt." Thomas Jefferson, letter to Baron von Humboldt, 1817, Ibid., p. 34.
Bryce commented at length on the topic.⁶ Being more observers than advocates, they saw, on one hand, that American democracy was strengthened and invigorated by the prominent influence of public opinion on political decision-making, and that, on the other, that this source of strength might also give rise to what they termed the tyranny of the majority.

**TWO CONFLICTING THEORIES**

In the literature of twentieth century political science, a distinctly republican dialogue has emerged between the "executive-force" theory, on the one hand, and the "literary" theory, on the other.

**Literary Theory**

The "literary" theory maintains that Congress agrees with the majority of public opinion at least as often as the President.⁷ The chief advocate of the literary theory is Alfred de Grazia, who claims that, "Congress is still able to legislate...at least as well as the

---


⁷"According to the advocates of the literary theory, Congress must assert its right to exercise 'all legislative powers.' Policies should be initiated by Congress at least as often as by the executive, for 'the primary business of the legislature in a democratic republic is to answer the big question of policy. '" Ibid., p. 349, cited by Davidson, op. cit., p. 20.
De Grazia is very concerned for fear that caesarism and the creation of a bureaucratic monarchy will crush the people's political rights and their voice via Congress. Roger Davidson, et al., observe that although a President represents all the people, he can never know as much as any one congressman about people in a given district or about all the people in all the districts as does Congress. Therefore, according to the literary theory, Congress is better able to discern the majority of public opinion, because of better communication with the people. For this reason, President William Henry Harrison conceded to Congress the ability to "...better understand the wants and wishes of the people."  

---


9 "For the defender of the literary theory, the legislator's legitimacy as the ultimate policy maker rests on his near monopoly of the channels of communication to the sovereign electorate. Since the President also is elected by and responsible to the electorate, this monopoly is not total. But the President is the only elected official in the executive branch; his constituency is diffuse, his mandate imprecise. Congressmen, on the other hand, are specific and precise representatives, who 'necessarily and properly reflect the attitudes and needs of their individual districts." Ernest S. Griffith, Congress: Its Contemporary Role (New York: New York University Press, 1951), p. 3, cited by Davidson, op. cit., p. 21.

10 "It is preposterous to suppose that a thought for a moment could be entertained that the President, placed at the capital, in the center of the country, could better understand the wants and wishes of the people than their own immediate representatives." William Henry Harrison, Inaugural Address, cited by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Congress and the Presidency (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1967), p. 8.
Yet, few contemporary political scientists consider the literary theory as valid. Instead, most agree with Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. who suggests that the high water mark of the literary theory was in the late 19th century, and that the executive-force theory offers a more accurate description for more recent times.  

Executive-Force Theory

The executive-force theory maintains that Presidents agree more often with the majority of public opinion than Congress.  

The theory may be reduced to two propositions. They are (a) that Congress

---

11"The struggle among branches of government is part of the health of the American polity, and its continuation make democracy possible by enabling the electorate to shift the weight of decision in one direction or another according to the results desired." Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. and Alfred de Grazia, Congress and the Presidency (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1967), p. 18.

12"As the only official elected by the whole population, the President is considered the embodiment of the nation. Legislators, represent partial and minority interests; the President represents the 'general will' of the community."

"...Theodore Roosevelt saw the President as a 'steward of the people'; and, some years before his own elevation to the office, Woodrow Wilson sensed its representative potentialities. 'His is the only national voice in affairs', he declared in his 1907 Columbia University lecture. 'He is the representative of no constituency, but of the whole people.'" Davidson, Kovenock and O'Leary, op. cit., pp. 28-29.
rarely agrees with the majority of public opinion, and (b) Presidents often agree with the majority of public opinion. In support of the first proposition, Samuel P. Huntington writes that Congress "... has defects as a representative body..." because it is isolated from the opinions of the polity. He cites the trend toward decreasing turnover in congressional membership which puts congressmen out of touch with a society undergoing unprecedented technological and social change. 13 James Burnham charges that Congress' "non-democratic structure" (e.g., the "senility" rule) has failed to represent the common interest. 14 James M. Burns thinks that the reason Congress has failed to "... mirror-and act on the sentiments of a popular majority," is that under-staffed congressmen with multiple committee responsibilities tend to favor organized interests of professional lobbies over

13 "In 1897, for each representative who had served ten terms or more in the House, there were 34 representatives who had served two terms or less. In 1961, for each ten-termer there were only 1.6 representatives who had served two terms or less." George B. Galloway, History of the United States House of Representatives (House Document 246, Eighty-seventh Congress, 1st session, 1962), p. 31; T. Richard Witmer, New York Times, Dec. 27, 1963, p. 24, cited by Samuel P. Huntington, "Congressional Responses to the Twentieth Century," The Congress and America's Future, David B. Truman (ed.) (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), pp. 16, 9.

14 "Because of its many-layered, labyrinthine, non-democratic internal structure, Congress seldom gives direct or isomorphic expression to the raw popular will. "From the point of view of rigorous democratism, this is a grievous fault, because a government ought to represent or express only the 'common;' 'national,' or 'general' interest." James Burnham, Congress and the American Tradition (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1959), p. 268.
the interests of unorganized individual citizens.  

Joseph S. Clark agrees that pressure from organized groups, and the tendency of the seniority rule to give committee chairmanships to conservatives have produced "...minority, not majority, rule..." in Congress.  

Walter Dean Burnham notes that several political scientists maintain that Congress' "procedural disorders" (e.g., seniority rule, and refusals of committee chairmen to report out bills they oppose), and "substantive irresponsibility" (e.g., congressmen being knowledgeable about only a fraction of the issues being legislated, and lack of congressional initiative) have made Congress increasingly unresponsive to the majority will of the people.  

Finally, the Americans for

---

15."...[B]oth the House and the Senate are defective as 'representative' bodies. And they both are organized and managed so as to yield to organized minorities at the expense of the great majority." James M. Burns, Congress on Trial (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), pp. 49, 65.

16."The trouble with the Congress today is that it exercises negative and unjust powers to which the governed, the people of the United States, have never consented. The heart of the trouble is that the power is exercised by minority, not majority, rule." Joseph S. Clark, The Sapless Branch (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 17.

17."...[F]rom (Woodrow) Wilson to Steven K. Bailey and James M. Burns a distinguished line of political scientists has...argued persuasively that present congressional practices and any kind of democratic theory which includes the notion of responsibility of rulers to the governed are incompatible, and that Congress' procedural disorders and substantive irresponsibility constitute a standing — and perhaps increasing — danger to free institutions in this country." Walter Dean Burnham, "Has Congress a Future?" Congressional Reform, Joseph S. Clark (ed.) (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1967), pp. 19-20.
Constitutional Action (ACA) rated two-thirds of the congressional leadership of 1968 as more conservative than Congress as a whole.\textsuperscript{18}

The fact that the conservative ACA rates most congressional leaders as conservative supports the proposition that an ideological bias exists in the congressional leadership.

In support of the second proposition that Presidents often agree with the majority of public opinion, Samuel P. Huntington observes that each succeeding administration brings fresh blood and new ideas from the people. The constant turnover of presidential administrations, he writes, "... is representative government along classic lines... and is a far more sensitive register of changing currents of opinion than is (the low turnover in) Congress."\textsuperscript{19} James Burnham notes that

\textsuperscript{18}"... (B)oth (House) Republican floor leaders have higher-than-average ACA scores (as do four of the five Democratic committee chairmen).

"Of the nine (Senate) floor leaders and chairmen, six have ACA scores higher than average...." Herbert Jacob, and Robert Weissberg, Elementary Political Analysis (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970), pp. 193-4.

\textsuperscript{19}"A continuous adjustment of power and authority takes place within each administration; major changes in the distribution of power take place in every administration. The Truman Administration represented one combination of men, interests, and experience, the Eisenhower Administration another, and the Kennedy Administration yet a third. Each time a new President takes office, the executive branch is invigorated in the same way the House of Representatives was invigorated by Henry Clay and his western congressmen in 1811. A thousand new officials descend on Washington, coming fresh from the people, representing the diverse forces behind the new President,
a number of writers have thought that because a President is elected by the entire electorate, he is more nearly representative of the general will than are members of Congress. Being elected on a regional basis and exercising unequal powers, congressmen are alleged to distort the general will.\textsuperscript{20}

**CONTRIBUTION OF THIS STUDY**

It may be seen from the above summary of recent literature that although students of political science have theorized about whether Congress or Presidents agree more often with the majority of public opinion (e.g., the executive-force theory vs. literary theory controversy), it does not appear that anyone has attempted a systematic investigation of that relationship. This study attempts to fill the gap with an empirical analysis of whether Congress or Presidents more often agree with the majority of public opinion polls.

Further, it is hoped that the study may present findings, which would suggest whether Congress or the Presidency is in greater need of and bringing with them new demands, new ideas, and new power. Here truly is representative government along classic lines and of a sort which Congress has not known for decades." Samuel P. Huntington, op. cit., p. 17.

\textsuperscript{20}"As part of the advance of democratism in both belief and practice, a plebiscitary of numerical majority comes to seem the only proper expression of the sovereign general will... The Presidency, as the office most nearly plebiscitary, is more and more felt to be the primary embodiment of the general will, and thus properly dominant over all other political magistrates and institutions." James Burnham, op. cit., pp. 334-335.
reform (in the republican context, noted above). For example, although the advocates of congressional reform have suggested various schemes for enhancing the ability of Congress to reflect the majority of public opinion, none has demonstrated by systematic empirical analysis that Congress warrants reform more than the presidency. 21

SUMMARY

Chapter I has considered the normative question of whether representatives ought to reflect public opinion. Also considered were the theoretical questions of (a) whether the executive-force theory or literary theory correctly describes existing relationships, (b) the contribution of this study's systematic empirical analysis to the literature

of political science, and (c) the application of the findings for determin­ing the need for governmental reform. In the next chapter, the literary theory and the executive-force theory will be made operational for systematic empirical analysis.
CHAPTER II
SYSTEMATIC EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM

In the preceding chapter, the literature of political science was surveyed in order to gain perspective on the question of whether Congress or Presidents agree more often with the majority of public opinion. Chapter II considers how the question can be made amenable to systematic empirical measurements. The chapter is divided into five sections, including (a) definitions, (b) assumption, (c) limitations, (d) hypothesis, and (e) summary.

DEFINITIONS

"Public opinion" means "...the expression by members of publics on controversial subjects."22 For this study, the operational definition of public opinion is the percentage measurements of a public opinion poll report.

"Difference of a public opinion poll" means the difference between the "Yes," and "No" percentages of an opinion poll report, after discarding the "No Opinion" percentage. For example, if a poll shows

---

"Yes" 75%, "No" 20%, and "No Opinion" 5%, then the difference is calculated by discarding the "No Opinion" (5%) and subtracting the lesser "No" 20% from the larger "Yes" 75%, leaving a difference of "Yes" 55%.

"Public issue" means a policy over which Congress and a President disagree, and for which a national public opinion poll report is available. Congressional-presidential disagreements are taken from the "Presidential Boxscore," Congressional Quarterly Almanac.

"Area" means one of the following six groups of congressional-presidential public issues: health, education and welfare; foreign policy; electoral reform; labor; civil rights; and tax and economic policy.

ASSUMPTION

National public opinion poll reports are assumed to be the most reliable measure of national public opinion available. The assumption is based on the historical fact that poll organizations made over 425 election predictions between 1944 and 1953 with an average error of less than three percent. Between 1960 and 1970, the Gallup surveys predicted the winning party in ten successive elections with an

---

average error of 1.6%. Moreover, the poll forecasts were within one percent of the presidential vote cast in 1960 and 1964.

Unlike election forecasts, however, opinion poll reports about public issues have no direct check on their reliability. One result is that poll organizations have been accused of using inferior sampling apparatus when conducting opinion surveys on public issues. Seymour Lipset, for example, comments that, "[s]tudies of non-election party preferences are often made with small quota samples and hence are much less reliable than an election study made with a big probability sample." 26

On the other hand, majority positions of poll reports have on numerous occasions agreed with the position adopted in subsequent legislation. 27 Gallup cites the following examples: re-arming on a vast


26 "The survey groups will devote an inordinate amount of resources to a general election, since if they turn out to be reasonably accurate they may use this fact for years to come as a means of eliciting business from clients who do not realize that they are not buying the same research model as that used in the election, but a much inferior one." Seymour M. Lipset, "A Private Opinion on the Polls," cited Ibid., p. 563.

27 "Public opinion polls in recent years have shown that the American public is far ahead of its legislators on many matters of social policy." Galloway, op. cit., p. 230.
scale (1935); peacetime draft; lend-lease; pay-as-you-go taxes; broadening the tax basis; Marshall Plan; United Nations; social security; federal aid to education; increasing the minimum wage; and government housing plans.  

While opinion poll reports on public issues may well be less reliable than those for elections, poll reports are more reliable measures of public opinion than the traditional measures of letters from constituents, lobbying by special interest groups, and editorials in newspapers. Poll reports are less biased, and consequently more reliable, measures because they incorporate random sampling techniques, while traditional measures do not. Random techniques are less biased because each citizen has the same chance of having his opinion heard as every other citizen. The traditional methods, on the other hand, are biased in favor of those citizens who hire lobbyists, write their congressmen, or are editors of newspapers.


29 "The most reliable way to choose the individuals to be included in a sample survey is to use some random method of selection. "Experience in survey work has demonstrated that if, instead of selecting at random, a surveyor tries to pick a representative sample by choosing certain people or places that he believes are representative, a biased sample will probably result." Eleanor E. MacCoby and Robert R. Holt, "How Surveys Are Made," cited by Christenson and McWilliams, op. cit., pp. 536-7.
Public Opinion Polls

In order to increase the reader's understanding of the polls, this section discusses techniques of systematic polling. The study is based on national opinion surveys made by the American Institute of Public Opinion (AIPO); the National Opinion Research Center (NORC); Louis Harris, Inc. (Harris); and the Opinion Research Corporation, Princeton (ORCP). Each survey attempts to construct a miniature of the entire populace of the nation by systematically selecting respondents. For the purposes of this study, it is assumed that the NORC, Harris, and ORCP polling methods are substantially the same and therefore as reliable as the AIPO or Gallup technique discussed below. 30

Gallup poll data account for the bulk of poll data used in this study.

The surveys are based on the concepts of "stratification" and "randomness." For example, stratification of the national population into its major socio-economic groups or strata and the random selection of a proportionate number of respondents from each group is one


Louis Harris and Associates (Harris): One of the Harris surveys used in this study, specifically the "LIFE poll...surveyed a cross-section of 4,047 Americans..." Life Magazine, Vol. 68, No. 1, 9 January 1970, pp. 102-6.

way to reduce the expense but not the reliability of an otherwise purely random poll. "Straw" polls which do not attempt stringent control of the sample are excluded from this study. Straw polls are usually based on ballots mailed in by the public, or "man in the street" interviews. Such a survey was the Literary Digest poll of 1936 which incorrectly predicted a 54%-41% victory by Landon over Roosevelt, an error of over 20%.

The Gallup technique entails dividing the nation into geographic units of equal population. One hundred sixty such units are selected at random and approximately ten interviews are conducted in each, providing a sample of 1,500 respondents. The survey is intended to reflect the opinions of the entire adult civilian population of the United States living in private households. About one-third of the questions asked concern background information about the respondent. This is checked against census figures to ascertain whether the proper

---

31 In order to reduce travel expenses for the interviewers, "... some method must be adopted to reduce the number of communities in which interviews are taken... . In selecting the counties where interviews will be taken, the survey director can cut down the sampling error by 'stratifying' the sample. This means simply that he will arrange all the counties of the country in order according to some characteristic (such as percent of Negro population), divide those ordered counties into strata (high, medium, and low), and select sample counties at random within each stratum, thus making sure that a proper proportion of counties with high, medium, and low Negro populations will come into the sample." Ibid., p. 539.

proportion of each population group is present in the sample.

According to Gallup, the accuracy of the survey depends, in part, upon the size of the sample, but that interviews in excess of a particular number (1,500) do not provide a significant increase in accuracy. 33 Accordingly, Gallup's "national survey results are based on interviews with a minimum of 1,500 adults." 34

The probable sampling error for most percentages given in Gallup Poll Reports is claimed to be within four percent. For example, if a poll report indicates 60 percent of the respondents favor a program, most of the time the percentage that would have been obtained, had the whole population actually been interviewed, should vary no more than 64 percent to 56 percent. Although Gallup claims his "samples of 1,500 have a tolerance of 3 to 4 percentage points 95 percent of the time," 35 one must discount his claim, because there is no known way to account so precisely for possible error introduced by stratification. 36

---

33 v. Appendix C, "The Gallup Design of the Sample" for a detailed discussion on how the Gallup organization selects its samples for polling.


35 Ibid.

36 "The errors in a sample which has not been selected by random methods cannot be estimated in any precise way." MacCoby and Holt, op. cit. (1962 edition), p. 489.
Nevertheless, the poll surveys are far more accurate gauges of public opinion than are the traditional methods discussed below.

Letters from Constituents

Letters from constituents are one of the traditional ways legislators have gauged the political opinions of their constituents. However, political letter writing is often the product of a prolific minority, and is likely to be a biased and unreliable index of public opinion. For example, in response to the question, "Have you ever written your Congressmen?", only 19 percent of those interviewed gave an affirmative answer (AIPO, 1965). In a study of the 1964 election, Philip E. Converse, et al. concluded that "...the large bulk of letters to public officials...comes from a tiny fraction of the population, which tends to write very repetitively....[O]nly about 15 percent of the adult population report ever having written from the grassroots, two thirds are composed by about 3 percent of the population."  

There is some evidence that experienced congressmen have learned not to place too much confidence in letters from constituents. Speaking of the 700 letters he receives daily, one Senator...


remarked that, "The conventional wisdom around the Senate is that there are many ex-Senators who voted according to their mail." Similarly, Representative Robert J. Corbett of Pennsylvania became convinced that letters mislead legislators. After conducting two opinion polls of the political views of his constituents in 1946, Corbett told the House, "I had been judging opinion on the basis of unsolicited letters and telephone calls from constituents. Like many others, I tended to believe that on a majority of questions that those who wrote, wired or telephone reflected typical opinion. They simply did not do so in most cases. Rather, they generally represented vocal minorities." 

**Lobbying by Special Interest Groups**

Special interest groups customarily hire lobbyists to solicit favorable votes from congressmen. Congressmen, in turn, rely on lobbyists to furnish arguments for and against pending legislation.

The lobby system, however, has been criticized because it gives "...small numbers of individuals who are acutely aware of their exclusive needs..." greater political influence than their numbers

---


warrant. The majority of citizens, who do not "...belong to a strong organization with a lobby in Washington [have]... little chance of influencing governmental policies... ." George Gallup makes an even more damaging argument (presumably based on systematic empirical research) by accusing spokesmen of labor organizations, farm leaders, heads of business associations, and officers of veterans' organizations of opposing the majority view of their members "on many occasions."

Press

"Congressmen... use their constituency newspapers... for opinion information..." on a regular basis. Local papers provide legislators with their only daily feedback on government policy. Consequently, public officials tend to "equate press reaction... with public reaction... ."

---


It would be a mistake, however, to equate press opinion with public opinion, for no other reason than newspapers are biased in favor of the prejudices of their editors and publishers who may or may not agree with the majority sentiment of subscribers. For example, an administration might release favorable press stories to selected local newspapers in order to create an aura of favorable national public opinion for its policies for the benefit of members of Congress. Such manipulation of the press probably has been practiced since the days of President Madison when an English visitor reported,

"It is no secret that some able personage at Washington writes letters on the politics and sends them to the remotest corners of the Union, to appear in their newspapers; after which, they are collected in the administration newspaper at Washington as testimonies of public opinion in the respective districts where they appear." 46

On the other hand, newspapers probably should be given credit for helping to shape public opinion, for opinion is formed in part by the information that appears in the press. But this is a different question from whether press opinion may be interpreted simultaneously as reflecting public opinion.

LIMITATIONS

This section considers the following five limitations encountered in examining the question at hand: (a) deficiency of opinion polls as measures of public opinion, (b) lack of comprehensive opinion poll report data between 1947 and 1969, (c) lack of data on public issues before 1947, (d) lack of randomness in pairing public issues with public opinion poll reports, and (e) lack of information on behind the scenes political pressures affecting public issues. Although little can be done to correct these deficiencies, the reader should at least be made aware of their existence.

Deficiencies of Public Opinion Polls

Public opinion has four dimensions which present difficulties in measurement by polling: (a) magnitude, (b) intensity, (c) salience, and (d) information.

Magnitude. Magnitude is the aggregate measure of direction of an individual respondent's approval or disapproval of an issue. Magnitude is expressed as a percentage measurement in opinion poll reports (e.g., 60% "Yes") and is the public opinion poll measurement most commonly used by political analysts. Magnitude may be affected by changes in either the phrasing, or the placement of poll

---

questions and answers. Magnitude can also be affected by whether answers are made by secret ballot or not.

Experience has shown that variation in the phrasing of interview questions about the same subject may elicit significantly different responses. This is because "...an opinion is an 'answer' that is given to a 'question' in a given situation. When the question or situation varies somewhat, a somewhat different response can be expected. Differences in the wording of questions may given different results..." For example, the emotive phrase "to maintain world peace" may have accounted for the 32 percent spread between the differences of 38 percent "Join" and 70 percent "Yes" in the two answers below.

After the war, would you like to see the United States join some kind of world organization, or would you like to see us stay out? (NORC, 1/1945)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Join</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay out</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Difference)</td>
<td>38% &quot;Join&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

48 Hadley Cantril has identified and discussed eleven problems associated with the wording of poll questions, and arranges them in the following three groupings: (a) effect of context, (b) alternatives presented, and (c) deviations from "objective" wording. v. Handley Cantril, Gauging Public Opinion (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944), pp. 23-50.

49 Lane and Sears, op. cit, p. 13.
Do you think the United States should join a world organization with police power to maintain world peace? (AIPO, 4/1945)

| Yes   | 81%   |
| No    | 11%   |
| No opinion | 8%   |
| (Difference | 70% "Yes") |

Experience also has shown that variation in the phrasing of interview answers about the same subject may elicit significantly different responses. Dichotomous answers (e.g., "Yes" or "No") may distort true opinion, for the respondent may be forced to suppress any qualifications he might otherwise voice in multiple-choice, or open-ended questions. For example, the introduction of the "About the same" category may have accounted for the 9 percent spread between the difference of 62 percent "Yes" and 53 percent "More" in the two questions below.

Do you think labor unions should be regulated to a greater extent by the Federal Government?

Yes 62%  No 20%  Don't know 18%

During the next four years, do you think there should be more regulation or less regulation of labor unions, by the Federal Government, than at present?

More 53%  About the same 12%  Less 16%  No Opinion 19%

(AIPO 5/3/40)

Another difficulty is that a dichotomous answer about a general issue may be a misleading index of public opinion about a specific

---

aspect of that more general issue. For example, after World War II, "[t]hose who were impressed by the new era of world cooperation heralded by the polls were rudely awakened when the polls got around to the British loan. Although roughly two-thirds of the population favor American participation in a world organization, only one-third approve of a loan to Britain." 52 That is to say, although the majority was in favor of international cooperation generally, the majority was opposed to a specific aspect of such cooperation, i.e., the loan to Britain.

On the other hand, multiple-choice, and especially open-ended answers allow the respondent to express himself with greater precision. 53 They also aid the interpreter of poll reports by preventing him from inadvertently confusing approval of one policy for disapproval of particular aspects of a conflicting policy. For example, "[i]n June 1941, when asked whether they favored the United States entering the war against Germany and Italy or staying out, 29 percent of one sample of the public said that they favored American entry. But when a similar sample was asked this question with several other

52 Cartwright, op. loc.

53 "When open-ended questions are used, people express their views together with any reservations or contingencies which are present in their minds: when they are presented with a polling question and asked to choose one of the alternatives, they may not have the opportunity to express their reservations, unless specific additional questions are asked to bring them out." MacCoby and Holt, op. cit., pp. 540-541.
options, such as supplying Britain with war materials, only 6 percent favored entering the war against Germany and Italy. (AIPO, 5/1941)"  

One difficulty in using multiple-choice answers, however, is that bias may be introduced by listing numerically more alternatives in favor of one side than another, or by presenting moderate alternatives for one side and an extreme alternative for the other.  

Experience has shown that variation in the placement or sequence of closely related questions may alter the magnitude of the respondent's answers. This is because an initial answer may commit the respondent to a position which logically restricts his choice of answers to subsequent questions. For example, the 34 percent spread between the differences of 10 percent "No" and 44 percent "No" in the following question may be attributed to placement. When asked initially, the question produced a difference of 10 percent "No."

At present men between the ages of 21 and 35 are being drafted. Should the law be changed so that only men between the ages of 18 and 23 would be included in the draft?

But the above question produced a difference of 44 percent "No" when it appeared on another ballot after the following question.

At present, men between the ages of 18 and 21 are not drafted. Do you think the law should be changed so that men between the ages of 18 and 21 would be included in the draft, along with those from 21 to 35?

---

54Lane and Sears, op. cit., p. 13. 55Cantril, op. cit., pp. 31-32.

56Ibid., p. 29.
Experience also has shown that variation in the placement of multiple-choice answers may affect the magnitude of respondent's answers. This may be because when "...a question is a fairly complicated one, there is a tendency for the respondent to select the last, more easily remembered, alternative." For example, of the two answers to the same question below, which appears last consistently polls the higher magnitude of opinion.

Which of these two statements do you think is closer to the truth?

1. England is now fighting mainly to keep her power and wealth.

2. England is now fighting mainly to preserve democracy against the spread of dictatorship.\(^57\)

Experience has shown that the magnitude of opinion may change significantly if the poll ballot is filled out in secret, and not by a poll interviewer, as is normally done. For example, the secret ballot may have accounted for the 20 percent spread between the differences of 29 percent "Yes" and 49 percent "Yes" in the answers to the same question below.

Do you think Jews have too much power and influence in this country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>(Difference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Ballot</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{57}\)Ibid., p. 35.
Hadley Cantril suggests that some respondents alter their expressions of opinion when they suspect that a poll interviewer might disagree with their unspoken opinion. Cantril observes that "[t]hese differences cast some doubt on the validity of the results obtained by the interview method when the subject feels that his answer, if known, would affect his prestige."\(^{58}\)

Despite the deficiencies of polls in measuring magnitude, polls still appear to be less misleading than the traditional measures of opinion for discovering the majority opinion. While the traditional measures above were shown to be misleading on a routine basis (e.g., the Senator's assertion that there are many ex-Senators who voted according to their mail), none of the examples of deficient polls cited left any doubt as to what was the majority opinion. Moreover, the above examples of closely-related polls were selected because they represented extremes in magnitude varience, whereas most other closely-related polls have less varience in magnitude.

**Intensity.** Intensity is the degree of feeling which a respondent has about his poll answer.\(^ {59}\) Intensity is seldom measured for poll

\(^{58}\) Ibid., p. 79

answers, but when it is the respondent is usually asked to indicate "Strong Approval," "Mild Approval," "No Opinion," "Mild Disapproval," or "Strong Approval." Although intensity is not usually measured, it is of great interest to the political analyst. Measures of intensity on political issues help him to guage the willingness of people to support a particular policy. Although the magnitude index of opinion indicates that a majority favors a particular bill, an intensity index might reveal that the approval is only a token one, and that not enough people are willing to participate in political activity in order to ensure the success of the bill. 60 Floyd H. Allport notes,

For example, a recent nationwide sample poll on birth control has revealed that a substantial majority of the people are in favor of it. Yet legislative action supporting it has not been generally forthcoming, probably because the desire for it was not sufficiently intense. That is...not felt acutely enough by the members of this majority to press for organized action in opposition to a minority who have a very intense feeling upon the other side. 61

Salience. Salience is the degree of importance that a respondent associates with topics under question. 62 Measures of salience are

60... [O]verwhelming support of a proposal, in the sense that a large number of people select it, does not necessarily mean at all that the people is intensely anxious to have the proposal adopted. It may mean that most people know little or nothing about the details of the proposal but see it as being related to some value which they do accept." Cartwright, op. cit., p. 229.

61 Allport, loc. cit. 62 Lane and Sears, op. cit., p. 15.
seldom made, but when they are the respondent is usually asked an open-ended question such as, "What kinds of things do you worry about the most?"

Salience is most reliably measured directly, and not as a function of magnitude and intensity. For example, suppose the magnitude and intensity indices about an issue indicate an even split between "Mild Approval" and "Mild Disapproval." A political analyst would be unwise to think of the issue as not salient, because the choice between the two answers may have been difficult to make, and although people may not feel intensely about either answer, they may tend to choose evenly between them. However, the people may still consider the issue as very important, and the prudent political analyst would investigate further.

Information. Information is the knowledge necessary to express an "informed," as opposed to an "uninformed" opinion. One criticism of opinion polls is that they indiscriminately mix the two kinds of opinion, and hence poll reports are unworthy of serious consideration by political analysts. Dorwin Cartwright argues that, "... it is doubtful that the 'average' man would have sufficient knowledge of most governmental problems to be able to make intelligent decisions without special information and study." Cartwright supports his

---

63 Cartwright, op. cit., p. 228.
position with examples of popular ignorance of public affairs.\footnote{For example, "...[I]n May 1945, Gallup reports that only 41 percent of the adult population knew what the T.V.A. is...." Cartwright, loc. cit.}

Francis O. Wilcox also expresses misgivings when he writes,
"...[P]ublic opinion can be wrong — or at least illogical."\footnote{Francis O. Wilcox, Congress, The Executive and Foreign Policy (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), p. 116.}

On the other hand, there is a deductive argument that uninformed opinion is as politically important as informed opinion, and empirical evidence that the uninformed share the same opinion as the well-informed. E. E. Schattschneider argues that in a democracy all opinions count as equally as do votes. He writes,

One implication of public opinion studies ought to be resisted by all friends of freedom and democracy; the implication that democracy is a failure because the people are too ignorant to answer intelligently all the questions asked by the pollsters.

There is no escape from the problem of ignorance, because nobody knows enough to run the government. Presidents, senators, governors, judges, professors, doctors of philosophy, editors and the like are only a little less ignorant than the rest of us.\footnote{Elmer E. Schattschneider, The Semisovereign People (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1950), pp. 135-7.}

Hadley Cantril points out that the practical effects of being well-informed as opposed to uninformed are not as great as one might suppose. After comparing well-informed opinion with uninformed
opinion, he concludes,

No differences of opinion occur between persons generally well-informed and those generally uninformed when both groups are equally lacking in reliable standards of judgment, where both groups have in common essentially the same standards of judgment, or where wish fulfillment and personal desire cut across information lines. 67

Lack of Comprehensive Poll Data

A second limitation is the availability of poll data and matching public issues, 1947-1969. Only 88 of 367 poll questions matched with the 881 public issues collected. This was because most of the poll questions did not meet the requirement of being asked within one year of the time of the public issue, and having a poll report difference in excess of 8 percent. The one year limit is an arbitrary attempt to control the effects of changing public opinion, 68 and other variables 69 in the research design, and at the same time ensure a sufficient number of poll-issue pairs of meaningful statistical analysis. The 8 percent difference limit was arrived at by assuming the highest probable sampling error of ± 4 percent as the smallest difference margin which has statistical significance at the

67 Cantril, op. cit., p. 219.


.95 level. No attempt was made to allocate the "No Opinion" responses in poll reports, and that percentage was discarded. Poll reports with more than 20 percent "No Opinion" were not used since they suggested opinion had not crystalized.

Sometimes several different surveys are published concerning the same issue during the year. This provided a check on the consistency of the reports. In such cases, the arithmetic mean of the relevant poll reports was used, instead of arbitrarily picking one poll report as representative.

Lack of Data on Public Issues

A third limitation is that information about Congressional-Presidential public issues prior to 1947 is not readily available. The relevant information has been compiled only since then in the Congressional Quarterly Almanac.

Lack of Randomness in Public Issue and Poll Difference Pairs

A fourth limitation is that the sample of Congressional-Presidential public issues and poll difference pairs is not a random selection. The basis of selection of the issues was the availability of relevant poll data.

Lack of Information on Behind the Scenes

A fifth limitation is that the sample of Congressional-Presidential public issues used for this study does not necessarily include
important behind the scenes political pressures and maneuvering. 70

Only the issues which appear in the Congressional Quarterly Almanac have been considered.

**HYPOTHESIS**

The primary question asked by this study is whether Congress or Presidents agree more often with the public will. 71

70... (N)o one can ever know how many proposals the executive refrains from making because of expected congressional resistance 'the ten thousand... drastic proposals cooking away in ten thousand bureaucratic heads in Washington that the attackers (of tradition) do not dare even to embody in a bill, do not dare even to mention, because the proposals would not stand a Chinaman's chance'. Willmoore Kendall, The Conservative Affirmation (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1963), pp. 30-31 as cited by Davidson, op. cit., p. 19.

71The policies on which Congress and Presidents are in agreement have been omitted for they contribute no insight as to the ability of Congress to agree with public opinion in comparison to Presidents. Only the comparison of disagreements with the respective poll data can furnish the answer to the question of relative agreement. Table 1, below, presents the possible relationships.

**TABLE 1.** POSSIBLE RELATIONSHIPS OF CONGRESS, PRESIDENTS, AND THE MAJORITY OF PUBLIC OPINION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship No.</th>
<th>Agreements (=) and Disagreements (≠)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Congress = Presidents = Opinion Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Congress = Presidents ≠ Opinion Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Congress ≠ Presidents = Opinion Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Presidents ≠ Congress = Opinion Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Congress ≠ Presidents ≠ Opinion Majority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship Nos. 1, 2, and 5 (i.e., "No Opinion" being a third position) are not relevant to this study. The study concerns itself with Relationship Nos. 3 and 4 as they are the only ones for which
Accordingly, the hypothesis is that Congress and Presidents agree equally as often with the difference of public opinion polls.\textsuperscript{72} If rejected, the hypothesis will indicate whether Congress, or Presidents agree more often with the majority of national public opinion.

**SUMMARY**

Chapter II has considered how the question can be made amenable for systematic empirical measurement. Included were the: (a) working definitions, (b) assumption that polls are the most reliable index of public opinion available, and (c) limitations both due to the inherent shortcomings of polls and the lack of certain data, and (d) development of the hypothesis. In the next chapter, the methods will be discussed for solving the question of whether Congress or Presidents agree more often with the majority of public opinion.

---

\textsuperscript{72}Formally stated, the hypothesis is that the positions of Congress and Presidents are independent of national public opinion poll differences.
CHAPTER III
METHODS

In the preceding chapter, the question of whether Congress or Presidents agree more often with the majority of public opinion was operationalized in order to make it amenable to systematic empirical analysis. Chapter III considers the methods used for investigating the question. The chapter is divided into four sections, including (a) research design, (b) sources of data, (c) predictions, and (d) summary.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The first step in testing the hypothesis was to compile a list of 881 congressional-presidential disagreements between 1947 and 1969. Then a collection was made of 367 relevant national opinion poll reports of the same time period. The third step was to match the 88 poll reports and congressional-presidential disagreements that occurred within one year of each other. Finally, a tabulation was made of the number of poll differences which agreed with the positions of Congress, and of the number of poll differences which agreed with the position of Presidents. This data is presented in summary form in Appendix A, and in detail in Appendix B.
SOURCES OF DATA

Data on the positions of Congress is drawn primarily from the "Presidential Boxscore," Congressional Quarterly Almanac (CQ), 1947-1969. There one finds congressional positions on presidential requests listed as favorable or unfavorable action as taken by House committee, House floor, Senate committee, and Senate floor. Favorable action includes passage of a request, while unfavorable action includes either voting down a request or taking no action on it (e.g., holding hearings in committee). "Since Congress does not always vote 'yes' or 'no' on a proposal, CQ evaluates legislative action to determine whether compromises amount to approval or rejection of the President's requests." In addition, important bills originating in Congress are taken from "Key Votes," Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1947-1969.

Data on the positions of Presidents are drawn primarily from the "Presidential Boxscore," Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1947-1969. The Boxscore limits itself to specific request for legislation made by a President. It omits proposals by administration officials; presidentially endorsed, but not requested measures; presidential suggestions not specifically requested; nominations; and routine

appropriation requests. In addition, presidential vetoes are obtained by referring to "Vetoes" in the Index, Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1947-1969.

Data on the positions of the majority of public opinion are drawn from the national opinion poll reports of the American Institute of Public Opinion; the National Opinion Research Center; Louis Harris and Associates; and the Opinion Research Corporation, Princeton; 1947-1969. The poll reports may be found in the Gallup Opinion Index; Gallup Poll Reports, 1935-1968; The Public Opinion Quarterly; Opinion Research Corporation, Princeton, Report; Appendix D, "How the Boxscore Works."

74 v. Appendix D, "How the Boxscore Works."


PREDICTIONS

Two possible outcomes may be anticipated from the data to be presented. They may (a) give support to the hypothesis of equality, or (b) reveal a disparity between Congress and the Presidency as reflectors of public opinion. If an equal or nearly equal number of poll differences are in agreement with the positions of Congress, and Presidents, then the hypothesis will be accepted and the executive-force theory, and literary theory will be shown to be equally valid.

If an unequal number of poll differences are in agreement with the positions of Congress, and Presidents, then the hypothesis of equality will be rejected and only one of the rival theories will be


shown to be valid. If the executive-force theory is correct, more poll differences will be in agreement with the positions of Presidents, than of Congress. If the literary theory is correct, more poll differences will be in agreement with the positions of Congress, than of Presidents.

**SUMMARY**

Chapter III has considered the methods used in investigating the question. Included were the (a) research design, (b) sources of data, and (c) predictions of possible outcomes. In the next chapter, the findings will be discussed, and thus answer the question of whether Congress or Presidents agree more often with the majority of public opinion.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

The preceding chapter considered the methods used in investigating the question of whether Congress or Presidents agree more often with the majority of public opinion. Chapter IV discusses the findings of this research. The chapter is divided into five sections including (a) conformity of observations to prediction, (b) interpretation of findings, and (c) summary.

CONFORMITY OF OBSERVATIONS TO PREDICTIONS

This section considers the extent to which the findings observed conform to the predictions of the previous chapter.

In Table 2 below, a Chi-Square Goodness-of-Fit test shows that there is little reason to accept the notion that positions of Congress and the Presidency concur equally often with public opinion. Based on this data, the hypothesis of equality may be rejected. Furthermore, the data suggest that the executive-force theory is correct because more poll differences agree with the positions of Presidents (56), than of Congress (32). Conversely, the literary theory may be rejected. The findings obtained by correlating public opinion poll differences with public issues is summarized in Table 2.
TABLE 2. DIFFERENCE-ISSUE PAIRS CORRELATED WITH 88 CONGRESSIONAL-PRESIDENTIAL PUBLIC ISSUES, 1947-1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll Differences Correlated with:</th>
<th>Congress n (%)</th>
<th>Presidents n (%)</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>Accept/Reject Hypothesis</th>
<th>Executive-Force, or Literary Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 88</td>
<td>32 (36%)</td>
<td>56 (64%)</td>
<td>6.54*</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Executive-Force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 6.54 > X^2_{0.05} = 3.841$  
* $p \leq 0.05$

INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS

This section considers two additional questions raised by the findings. One is whether the executive-force theory holds its explanatory power across several areas of public issue, or whether the literary theory might be valid for at least some areas. A second question is whether the executive-force theory is valid as the public expresses itself more clearly, that is, as the magnitude of poll differences increases.

Problem of Areas

This section considers the relative ability of Congress, and Presidents to reflect the majority of public opinion according to the area of the public issue. Although the above findings indicate that Presidents agree more often than Congress with the majority of public
opinion, another question is whether the executive-force theory is valid for all areas of public issue. That is, are Presidents more sensitive to the majority of public opinion in each of the areas of public issue: health, education and welfare; foreign policy; labor; civil rights; electoral reform; and tax and economic policy?

The first step of investigation was to rank 88 public issue and poll difference pairs according to area of the public issue. The second step was to construct a histogram of that relationship (v. Figure 2). The third step was to normalize the histogram in Figure 2 to a common scale by converting the number of difference-issue pairs into percentages (v. Figure 3).

In the two areas of electoral reform, and health, education and welfare, the data support the executive-force theory. In the areas of foreign policy, labor, civil rights, and tax and economic policy, the data are inconclusive. Although inconclusive, the data suggest that the executive-force theory may be valid for labor issues, while the literary theory may be valid for tax and economic issues.

The marginal difference by which Congress, and Presidents agree with the majority of public opinion in each of the six areas of public issues is summarized in the following table.

83v. Appendix A, "88 Poll Difference-Public Issue Pairs (abridged)."
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Figure 3. Normalized Histogram of Difference-Issue Pairs According to Area
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TABLE 3. DIFFERENCE-ISSUE PAIRS CORRELATED WITH 6 AREAS OF PUBLIC ISSUES, 1947-1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 Areas of Public Issues</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Congress (% )</th>
<th>Presidents (% )</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>Executive-Force, or Literary Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health, Education and Welfare</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>15 (93%)</td>
<td>12.25*</td>
<td>Executive-Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Policy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8 (44%)</td>
<td>10 (56%)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>5 (83%)</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10 (43%)</td>
<td>13 (57%)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Reform</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>Executive-Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax and Economic Policy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12 (71%)</td>
<td>5 (29%)</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ df = 1 \]
\[ X^2_{0.05} = 3.841 \]

Problem of Poll Differences

This section considers the relative ability of Congress, and Presidents to reflect the majority of public opinion according to the size of the poll difference. Although the above findings indicate that Presidents agree more often than Congress with the majority of public opinion, another question is whether the executive-force theory is valid for all sizes of the majority of public opinion. That is, are Presidents more sensitive than Congress to the majority of public opinion?
opinion for all magnitude of poll difference; whether the magnitude be marginal, intermediate, or very large?

The first step of investigation was to rank 84 public issue and poll difference pairs according to the magnitude of the poll differences. The second step was to construct a histogram of that relationship (v. Figure 4). An interval of five 16.8 percent increments was selected as it produced the maximum number of data points without destroying the uniform curvilinearity of the relationship. The third step was to normalize the histogram in Figure 4 to a common scale by converting the number of difference-issue pairs into percentages (v. Figure 5).

In the interval of marginal poll difference magnitude (8-24.8 percent), the data are inconclusive, but suggest that the executive-force theory and literary theory may be equally valid, because the distribution is perfectly divided (50 percent Congress vs. 50 percent Presidents) in this interval. In the two intervals of intermediate poll difference (24.9-41.6 percent, and 41.7-58.2 percent), the data support the executive-force theory. In the third interval of intermediate poll difference magnitude (53.3-75.2 percent), the data are inconclusive, but suggest that the executive-force theory may be valid. In the

---

84 v. Appendix E, "84 Public Issue and Poll Difference Pairs Ranked According to the Magnitude of the Difference." Appendix E has four issue-difference pairs (issue numbers 7, 43, 57 and 58) fewer than Appendices A and B because precise percentages were unavailable in these cases.
Figure 4. Histogram of Difference-Issue Pairs According to Difference Magnitude
Figure 5. Normalized Histogram of Difference-Issue Pairs According to Difference Magnitude
interval of very large poll difference magnitude (75.3-92 percent),
the data are inconclusive, but suggest that the literary theory may
be valid.

The marginal difference by which Congress, and President agree
with the majority of public opinion in each of the five magnitudes of
poll difference is summarized in the following table.

**TABLE 4. DIFFERENCE-ISSUE PAIRS CORRELATED WITH 5
MAGNITUDES OF POLL DIFFERENCE, 1947-1969**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Magnitudes of Poll Difference</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Congress n (%)</th>
<th>Presidents n (%)</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>Executive-Force, or Literary Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.0-24.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.9-41.6%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>19 (76%)</td>
<td>6.76*</td>
<td>Executive-Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.7-58.2%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4 (18%)</td>
<td>18 (82%)</td>
<td>8.91*</td>
<td>Executive-Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.3-75.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 (37%)</td>
<td>5 (63%)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.3-92.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6 (67%)</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 1
*p ≤ 0.05

$X_{0.05} = 3.841$
Chapter IV has considered the findings which answer the question of whether Congress or Presidents agree more often with the majority of public opinion. The findings supported the executive-force theory for public issues treated as a whole. In addition, the executive-force theory was accepted for two public issue areas (electoral reform; and health, education and welfare). The executive-force theory was also accepted for two of three intervals of intermediate poll difference magnitude. The executive-force and literary theories appear to be equally valid for the interval of marginal poll difference magnitude. In the next chapter, conclusions will be drawn from the above findings.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

The preceding chapter considered the findings answering the question of whether Congress or Presidents agree more often with the majority of public opinion. Chapter V draws two conclusions from the findings.

The initial conclusion is that the question under study is more complex than the literature of political science would lead us to believe. Although the executive-force theory was accepted for public issues taken as a whole, we also observed that neither Congress nor the Presidency was a consistent reflector of public opinion among the eight public issue areas measured. Although data on the question of areas were not conclusive (partly because it was not the primary question of study), the prominence of the Presidency in two areas, and the relative equality of the Presidency and Congress in the others seemed sufficient to suggest that the representative quality of either institution varied according to the issue area.

One curious footnote related to the above observation is that in the one area in which the President has the greatest amount of discretion (i.e., foreign policy) and in which one might reasonably expect him to be able to lead public opinion the most often, the Presidency
and Congress tended to be closest in their ability to reflect public opinion. On the other hand, in the area in which the legislative branch has its greatest amount of discretion (i.e., tax and economic policy), the data showed a slight tendency for Congress to reflect the majority of public opinion more often than the Presidency.

The prominence of the Presidency in two magnitudes of poll difference and the relative equality of Congress and the Presidency in the others suggest that the representative quality of Congress and Presidents also varies according to the size of public opinion majorities. It appears that when the majority of public opinion is marginal, Congress and the Presidency had an equally difficult time discerning which side of an issue a slight majority of public opinion might lie. This is what one might reasonably expect with small differences of opinion. Although one also might expect that as the majority of opinion increases that Congress and the Presidency would find it increasingly easier to discern the majority position and agree with it at the same rate, this did not prove to be the case. For some unknown reason the Presidency was able to agree more often with the intermediate sizes of majority of public opinion than was Congress. Similarly one might also expect the Presidency, and Congress to agree equally as often with the very large majorities of public opinion, as they are the most easily discernable and the most politically important. Surprisingly enough, when very large magnitudes of poll
difference were involved, Congress had a slight tendency to agree more often with the majority of public opinion than the Presidency.

The second conclusion is that systematic empirical analysis supports the contention that reform in Congress is more urgently needed than reform in the Presidency in order for American democracy to reflect more accurately the public will. This conclusion is based on the fact that the literary theory was not accepted in any of the measurements made in the study, while the executive-force theory was accepted in five measurements.

More specifically, the study identified two areas (i.e., electoral reform, and health, education, and welfare) out of six in which Congress is at its poorest as a reflector of public opinion. One application of this finding might be as a standard to order priorities among the myriad proposals for congressional reform (e.g., abolition of the seniority rule, oversight of the executive, campaign financial disclosure, personal financial disclosure, implementation of age limit, restatement of congressional ethics, and modernized congressional information service). That is, reform proposals might be evaluated in terms of their relative utility in enhancing the ability of Congress to reflect the public will in the areas in which Congress now does its poorest.

85 These were among the topics discussed in the ad hoc Senate Committee for Congressional Reform hearings, chaired by Senators Charles MacMathias, Jr. (R-Md.) and Adlai E. Stevenson, II (D-Ill.), 3-5 December 1972.
SUMMARY

Chapter V has drawn two conclusions from the findings. The first is that the question of whether Congress or Presidents agree more often with the majority of public opinion is a simplistic one, for neither institution consistently reflects public opinion among different public issue areas or poll difference magnitudes. The second conclusion is that systematic empirical analysis indicates that the Congress is more in need of reform than the Presidency if the American Government is to reflect the public will more often than not. More specifically, two areas were identified (i.e., electoral reform, and health, education and welfare) in which Congress reflects the public will the least often, and consequently are two areas (out of the six this study investigated) for which congressional reform should have priority.
APPENDIX A

88 POLL DIFFERENCE-PUBLIC ISSUE PAIRS (ABRIDGED)

Symbols for Entries

\( x \) = initiated

\( s \) = same

\( + \) = increase or establish

\( - \) = decrease or abolish

\( pd \) = poll difference

\( ? \) = information unavailable
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No.*/Issue/Year</th>
<th>pd %</th>
<th>Congress ≠ Presidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. +Health Insurance/1961</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. +Health Insurance/1964</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. +Health Insurance/1968</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. +Rat Control/1968</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. +Aid to School Construction/1957</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. +Aid to School Construction/1960</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. +Aid to School Construction/1963</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. -Aid to Segregated Schools/1957</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. -Aid to Segregated Schools/1963</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. +Student Loans/1964</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. +Social Security Benefits/1964</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. +Anti-Poverty Program/1966</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. +Welfare Reform/1969</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. +Unemployment Insurance/1965</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. +Summer Camps/1967</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices B and E.
### FOREIGN POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No. */Issue/Year</th>
<th>pd %</th>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>Presidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. -Foreign Military Assistance/1966</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. +Non-Military Foreign Aid/1947</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. +Non-Military Foreign Aid/1949</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. +Non-Military Foreign Aid/1957</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. +Non-Military Foreign Aid/1960</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. +Non-Military Foreign Aid/1960</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. +Non-Military Foreign Aid/1967</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. +Non-Military Foreign Aid/1967</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. +Non-Military Foreign Aid/1967</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. +Foreign Aid/1966</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. +Foreign Aid/1967</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. +Universal Military Training/1947</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. +Universal Military Training/1948</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. +Universal Military Training/1950</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. +Immigration by Skill/1964</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. +Immigration by Skill/1965</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. +USSR Wheat Sales/1962</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. +Voice of America/1947</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices B and E.*
## LABOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No. */Issue/Year</th>
<th>pd %</th>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>Presidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. +Job Training/1969</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. +Strike Control/1966</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. +Minimum Wage/1947</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. +Minimum Wage/1948</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. +Minimum Wage, Overtime/1965</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. +Day-Care Centers/1969</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices B and E.*
### CIVIL RIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No. <em>/Issue</em>/Year</th>
<th>pd %</th>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>Presidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Gun Ban for Minors/1967</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Universal Gun Licensing/1968</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. School Integration/1963</td>
<td>50-75</td>
<td></td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Open Housing/1966</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Open Housing/1967</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Open Housing/1967</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Open Housing/1967</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Open Housing Enforcement/1967</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Open Housing Financing/1968</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Voting Rights/1963</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Wiretap/1968</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Equal Employment Opportunity/1949</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Equal Employment Opportunity/1963</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Anti-Discrimination, Employment/1968</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Public Accomodations/1963</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Civil Rights Bill/1966</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Lower Voting Age/1954</td>
<td>16-58</td>
<td></td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Lower Voting Age/1955</td>
<td>16-58</td>
<td></td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices B and E.*
CIVIL RIGHTS (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No. */Issue/Year</th>
<th>pd %</th>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>Presidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59. -Voting Age/1968</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. +D.C. Home Rule/1949</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. +D.C. National Suffrage/1954</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. +D.C. Home Rule/1964</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. +D.C. Home Rule/1965</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices B and E.*
**ELECTORAL REFORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No. */Issue/Year</th>
<th>pd%</th>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>Presidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64. +Campaign Expenditure Regulation/1966</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. -Campaign Expenditure Ceiling/1966</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. -Limit Campaign Contributions/1967</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. -Campaign Expenditure Ceiling/1967</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. +Campaign Contribution Regulation/1967</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. +Campaign Fund Reporting/1968</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. +Direct Popular Election of President/1969</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. +House Term/1966</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices B and E.*
# TAX AND ECONOMIC POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No.*/Issue/Year</th>
<th>pd %</th>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>Presidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72. -Personal Income Tax/1947</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. -Personal Income Tax/1948</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>x, pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. -Personal Income Tax/1963</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. s Personal Income Tax/1957</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. -Personal Income Tax/1960</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. -Personal Income Tax/1963</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. +Personal Income Tax/1965</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. +Personal Income Tax/1967</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. +Personal Income Tax/1967</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. +Revenue Sharing/1969</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. +Defense Spending/1968</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. +Defense Spending/1969</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. +Space Spending/1967</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. +Space Spending/1969</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. +National Debt Limit/1953</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. +Price &amp; Wage Control/1951</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>x, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. +Postal Rates/1957</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices B and E.
APPENDIX B

88 POLL DIFFERENCE-PUBLIC ISSUE PAIRS (UNABRIDGED)

Symbols for Entries

H = House of Representatives
HC = House Committee
S = Senate
SC = Senate Committee
y = favorable action, yes
n = unfavorable action, no
= no action taken
h = hearings only
s = same
+ = increase or abolish
= decrease or abolish
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Issue No.*/Issue/Year

1: Health Insurance/1961: "Enact a health insurance program under the Social Security System providing benefits to all persons 65 and over who are eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits."

AIPO, 9 June 1961: "Would you favor or oppose having the Social Security tax increased in order to pay for old age medical insurance?"

 Favor  Oppose  No Opinion  Difference = 41%
 67%   26%    7%  POQ, XXV, p. 661.

2: Health Insurance/1964: "Enact a hospital insurance program for the aged which would protect against the costs of hospital and skilled nursing care, home health services and out-patient hospital diagnostic services and which would provide a base which related private programs can supplement."

AIPO; October 1964: Medicare Program:

 Favor  Oppose  No Opinion  Difference = 27%
 58%   31%    11%  EQ; XX, p. 90.

3: Health Insurance/1968: "Pass the Child Health Act to provide comprehensive medical care for every needy mother and her infant."

EQ; XXIV, p. 101.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE (Continued)

**Issue No.*/Issue/Year**

Harris, 1969: "A universal health insurance system, with both government and private organizations involved, . . . . "

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Difference = 40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 60%   | 20%    | 20%      | *Life, Vol. 68, No. 1, 9 January 1970*

4. +Rat Control/1968: "Appropriate $20 million in supplemental fiscal 1968 funds to help exterminate the rats that infest the slums."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HC</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Difference = 19%

*CQ, XXIV, p. 112*

Harris, November 1967: "A Federal program to exterminate rats in the slums."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Difference = 27%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 60%       | 33%           | 7%       | *Polls, III, No. 2, p. 81,*

Average Plurality = 27%

5. +Aid to School Construction/1957: "Authorize $1.3 billion, at the rate of $325 million annually for four years for federal grants to states for financing school buildings."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HC</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AIPPO, 10 February 1957: "Some people say that the Federal government in Washington should give financial help to build new public schools, especially in the poorer states. Others say that this will mean higher taxes for everyone and that states and local communities should build their own schools. How do you yourself, feel — do you favor or oppose Federal aid to help build new public schools."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Difference = 57%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 76%   | 19%    | 5%         | *PONS, 10 February 1957*

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.*
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE (Continued)

Issue No.*/Issue/Year

6. +Aid to School Construction/1960: "Authorize annual federal advances to local school districts to pay up to half debt service (principal and interest) on $3 billion of bonds to be issued in the next five years for school construction."

HC H SC S CQ, XVI, p. 94
n n n n

AIPO, 19 February 1960: "Some people say that the Federal government in Washington should give financial help to build new schools, especially in the poorer states. Others say that this will mean higher taxes for everyone and that states and local communities should build their own schools. How do you, yourself, feel — do you favor or oppose Federal aid to help build new public schools?"

Favor Oppose No Opinion Difference = 40%
65% 25% 10% PONS, 19 February 1960

7. +Aid to School Construction/1963: "Provide grants to public and private nonprofit institutions for training of scientific, engineering and medical technicians in two-year college-level programs, covering up to 50 percent of the cost of constructing, equipping and operating the necessary academic facilities."

HC H SC S CQ, XIX, p. 85
h h

AIPO, 10 February 1963: "Weight of public opinion now holds aid should go to both public, parochial schools."

? Difference = 51%-100%
Gallup Poll Reports, p. 354.

8. +Aid to Segregated Schools/1957: "Enact school construction bill without restricting provisions dealing with integration."

HC H SC S CQ, XIII, p. 88
y n

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE (Continued)

Issue No. */Issue/Year

AIPO, 11 February 1957: "Some people say that the Federal government in Washington should give financial help to build new public schools, especially in the poorer states. Others say this would mean higher taxes for everyone and that states and local communities should build their own schools. How about communities in the South where white and colored children are separated? Should the government help these communities — or refuse to help them build schools?"

Aid all Schools  Don't Aid Segregated Schools  No Opinion
73%  17%  10%

Difference = 56%
POQ, XXVI, p. 143.

9. Aid to Segregated Schools/1963: "Eliminate the phrase 'separate but equal' from the Morrill Land Grant College Act."

HC  H  SC  S
h  CQ, XIX, p. 90.

AIPO, 13 February 1963: "If the Federal government in Washington decides to give money to aid education, should this money go to all public schools, or should it be withheld from schools which fail to integrate white and negro students?"

Go to all public schools  Not to segregated  No opinion
72%  21%  7%

Difference = 51%
PONS, 13 February 1973

10. Student Loans/1964: "Authorize federally guaranteed student loans."

HC  H  SC  S
h  y  CQ, XX, p. 90

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE (Continued)

Issue No.* /Issue/Year

Harris, December 1965: "College Scholarships" (in the context of being federally sponsored).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Difference = 78%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Polls, III, No. 2, p. 79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. +Social Security/1964: "To finance the (hospital insurance program for over 65-ers), add one-fourth of one percent to the social security contribution paid by employers and employees."

HC H SC S
h n y

CQ, XX, p. 91

AIPO, 30 March 1965: "Would you be willing to have more money deducted from your paycheck in order to increase social security benefits to retired workers, or not?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Difference = 15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Public Opinion News Service, 31 March 1965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. +Antipoverty Program/1966: "The Johnson Administration's 'War on Poverty' received an appropriation from Congress in 1966 of $1,612,000...$138 million less than the President's request and the amount antipoverty officials said was the irreducible minimum needed for continued progress."

HC H SC S
y y y y

CQ, XXII, p. 250

AIPO, 6 May 1966: "Overall, do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of the anti-poverty program nationwide?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Unfavorable</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Difference = 17%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Polls, II, 2, p. 85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices 'A' and 'E.'
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE (Continued)

**Issue No. */Issue/Year**


   HC H SC S CQ, XXV, p. 120

   **AIPO, August 1969:** Nixon's welfare proposals.

   Favorable  Unfavorable  No Opinion  Difference = 45%
   65%       20%             15%

14. **+Guaranteed Income/1969:** "Revise welfare system to provide that the Federal Government pay a basic income to those American families who cannot care for themselves, in whichever state they live."

   HC H SC S CQ, XXV, p. 120
   y       y       y

   **Harris, 1969:** "The Nixon welfare plan — which would give every family on welfare $1,600 a year with a provision that anyone able to work either enter a job training program or get a job."

   Favor  Oppose  Not Sure  Difference = 66%
   79%   13%      8%       Life, loc. cit.

15. **+Unemployment Insurance/1965:** "Strengthen the unemployment insurance system by providing a permanent program of federal extended benefits for long-term unemployed with substantial work histories."

   HC H SC S CQ, XXI, p. 111.

   *Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.*
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE (Continued)

Issue No. */Issue/Year

AIPO, 13 February 1965: "How do you feel about unemployment benefits? Should the period during which unemployed workers can collect these benefits be extended, or not?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should be extended</th>
<th>Should not</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 13%

Polls, I, 2, p. 73

16. +Summer Camps/1967: "Provide funds for the construction of summer camp facilities for at least 100,000 children in 1968 (included in S 1545, HR 8311)."

Harris, 14 August 1967: "Setting up massive summer camps?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Difference = 25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Polls, III, 2, p. 81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Harris, November 1967: "Setting up massive summer camps?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Difference = 9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
FOREIGN POLICY

Issue No./Issue/Year

17. Foreign Military Assistance/1966: "In an unusual action, the Senate voted a major cut in the President's requests for foreign military aid and sales programs July 27. It accepted an amendment chopping $100 million off the authorization bill, 55-37 (D 43-20; R 12-17).

"The Administration asked for $917 million for fiscal 1967.... The final authorization was for $875 million."

CQ, XXII, p. 92

AIPO, 13 March 1966: "Which, if any of the kinds of foreign aid listed on this card do you favor?" GPI, No. 10, p. 21

Difference = 86%

Train teachers, build schools, provide books ...... 65%
Build hospitals, trains nurses and doctors,
provide medicine ......................................... 61%
Help improve farming methods, provide farm
equipment .................................................. 61%
Provide birth control information .................... 43% = 92%
Send surplus food ...................................... 41%
Help build factories and industries ................ 33%
Build highways and railroads ....................... 21%
None of these ........................................... 4%

Help build military strength ........................ 18% = 6%

No opinion ............................................... 8% = 2%


HC H SC S CQ, III, p. 534.

AIPO, 23 July 1947: "Those who heard or read of the Marshall Plan were asked: 'What is your opinion of the plan?''

Favor Oppose No Opinion Difference = 36%
57% 21% 22% POQ, XXVIII, p. 168.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
FOREIGN POLICY (Continued)

Issue No.*/Issue/Year


HC H SC S CQ, V, p. 46.

NORC, March 1949: "In general, do you think it is a good policy for the United States to try to help backward countries in the world to raise their standard of living, or shouldn't this be any concern to our Government?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should</th>
<th>Should not</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POQ, XV, p. 39Q


HC H SC S CQ, XIII, p. 89.

AIPO, 3 February 1957: "Would you approve or disapprove if the United States gave economic — that is financial — aid to the countries in the Middle East area that are friendly to the United States?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Neither, Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 51%

PONS, 3 February 1957.


HC H SC S CQ, XVI, p. 95.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
FOREIGN POLICY (Continued)

**Issue No.*/Issue*/Year**

AIPO, 2 July 1961: "Here is a list of items for which President Kennedy has asked Americans to make sacrifices. For which of these would you be willing to make sacrifices, even if it meant increasing your own taxes?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased Economic Aid</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PONS, 2 July 1961.

22. **Non-Military Foreign Aid/1961**: "Provide $1.9 billion per year for long-term loans in fiscal years 1963 through 1966."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HC</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CQ, XVIII, p. 97

AIPO, 2 July 1961: See Note 51 (same poll)

23. **Non-Military Foreign Aid/1967**: "Approve a specific program of increased aid to Latin America by up to $1.5 billion, or about $300 million annually for five years."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HC</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CQ, XXIII, p. 167.

AIPO, 13 May 1967: "President Johnson has proposed that Congress set aside about $3.1 billion for aid to countries in other parts of the world, of about 2 percent of the total amount of the annual budget. Would you like to see this amount increased or decreased?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 74%

GPI, No. 27, p. 17.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.*
FOR FOREIGN POLICY (Continued)

**Issue No.*/*Issue/Year**

24. *(Non-Military Foreign Aid/1967)*: "Authorize a U.S. contribution of up to $200 million, over four years, to new Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank."

   **HC H SC S**  
   **AIPO, 13 May 1967:** v. Note 53 (same poll)


   **HC H SC S**  
   **AIPO, 3 February 1956:** "During recent years Congress has appropriated (about) 4 billion dollars each year for countries in other parts of the world to help prevent their going communistic. Should Congress appropriate the same amount this year or not?"

   **Favor**  **Oppose**  **No Opinion**  **Difference = 32%**
   **57%**  **25%**  **18%**

   **POQ, XXVII, p. 168.**

26. *(Foreign Aid/1966)*: (HR 17788) "Congress authorized foreign aid appropriations of $3.5 billion, more than the President asked for, but when it came time on September 20 to appropriate funds, the House was of a different mind. It accepted an option to send the bill back to committee with instructions to make additional cuts totaling 10 percent in economic aid. The motion carried narrowly, 186-183 (D 70-175; R 116-8). The Senate increased the cut and the final appropriation was 15 percent below the Administration's request. Johnson opposed the motion."

   **HC H SC S**  
   **AIPO, 3 February 1956:** "During recent years Congress has appropriated (about) 4 billion dollars each year for countries in other parts of the world to help prevent their going communistic. Should Congress appropriate the same amount this year or not?"

   **Favor**  **Oppose**  **No Opinion**  **Difference = 32%**
   **57%**  **25%**  **18%**

   **POQ, XXVII, p. 168.**

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.*
FOREIGN POLICY (Continued)

Issue No.*/Issue/Year

AIPO, 1 April 1965: "President Johnson has proposed that Congress set aside about $3.4 billion for aid to countries in other parts of the world, or about 3 percent of the total annual budget. Would you like to see this amount increased or decreased?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decreased</th>
<th>Kept Same</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 10%
Polls, I, 2, p. 77

27. +Foreign Aid/1967: "Appropriate $2.5 billion for economic assistance, and $600 million for military assistance in fiscal year 1968."

HC H SC S CQ, XXIII, p. 167.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 12%


HC H SC S CQ, III, p. 535.

NORC, May 1947: "Should every able-bodied American twenty years old be required to go into the Army or Navy for one year?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Difference = 33%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>NORC Report No. 35, p. 44.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
FOREIGN POLICY (Continued)

**Issue No. */Issue/Year**

29. **Universal Military Training/1948:** "Universal military training."
   
   AIPO, January 1948: "In the future, do you think every able-bodied young man (who has not already been in the armed forces) should be required to take military or naval training for one year?"
   
   Yes  No  No Opinion  
   65%  24%  11%  
   Difference = 41%
   
   POQ, XV, p. 393.

30. **Universal Military Training/1950:** "Enact universal military training."
   
   AIPO, August 1950: "In the future, do you think every able-bodied young man (who has not already been in the armed forces) should be required to take military or naval training for one year?"
   
   Yes  No  No Opinion  
   78%  17%  5%  
   Difference = 61%
   
   POQ, XV, p. 393.

31. **Immigration by Skill/1964:** "Lift bars of discrimination against those seeking entry into the United States, particularly those with much-needed skills and those joining their families."
   
   HC  H  SC  S  
   y  n  n  
   CQ, XX, p. 93

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.*
AIPO, 25 July 1965: "The current immigration law restricts the number of persons coming from some countries more than others. This is called the 'quota' system. Would you favor or oppose changing this law so that people would be admitted on the basis of their occupational skills rather than on the basis of the country they come from?"

Favor  Oppose  No Opinion  Difference = 29%
51%  32%  17%  GPI, No. 3, August 1965, p. 14.

32. Immigration by Skill/1965: "Grant first preference to those with skills or attainments especially advantageous to our society."

HC  H  SC  S  CQ, XXI, p. 104.
n  n  n  n

AIPO, 25 July 1965: "Immigrant should: 'Have occupational skills?"

Very Important  Not very Important  No Opinion
71%  21%  8%

AIPO, 25 July 1965: "Country where he was born?"

Very Important  Not very Important  No Opinion
33%  56%  11%


Harris, December 1965: "Immigration based on individual skill rather than country quota."

Approve  Disapprove  Difference = 40%
70%  30%  Polls, III, No. 2, p. 79.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
FOREIGN POLICY (Continued)

Issue No. */Issue/Year

33. USSR Wheat Sales/1962: "Laushe amendment to prohibit (furnishing of aid under the Foreign Assistance Act or) sale of gift of surplus agricultural commodities under PL 480 to any country known to be dominated by Communism or Marxism."

HC H SC S CQ, XVIII, p. 76.

AIPQ, 24 October 1963: "Russia wants to buy wheat from the U.S. Do you approve or disapprove of our selling surplus wheat to Russia?"

Approve Disapprove No Opinion Difference = 29%
60% 30% 9% Polls, Vol. I, p. 52.

34. Voice of America/1947: "Foreign Information Program" (Voice of America).

HC H SC S CQ, III, p. 534.

AIPQ, December 1948: "It has been suggested that the United States should spend as much money in telling our side of the story to Europe and the world as Russia spends in telling her side. Do you agree or disagree?"

Agree Disagree No Opinion Difference = 31%
58% 27% 15% POQ, XXV, p. 303.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
LABOR

Issue No. */Issue/Year

35. +Job Training/1969: "Provide major expansion of job training and day care facilities under new basic income program."

Harris, 1969: "Expanded job training programs for disadvantaged groups."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Life, op. loc.

36. +Strike Control/1966: "Provide effective means for dealing with strikes that may cause irreparable damage to the national interest."

Harris, 16 October 1967: "Do you favor or oppose the right of defense workers to strike?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Polls, III, No. 4, p. 83.

37. +Minimum Wage/1947: "Increase minimum wage."

AIPO, 14 June 1947: "At the present time the minimum (lowest) wage that can be paid to workers in every state in most businesses and industries is 40¢ an hour. This means that all persons working in such businesses, in every state, including young people who have never worked before, cannot be paid less than 40¢ an hour. Would you approve or disapprove of raising this minimum to 65¢ an hour?"

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.*
LABOR (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No. */Issue/Year</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38. +Minimum Wage/1948:</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POQ, XXVI, p. 293.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. +Minimum Wage Overtime/1965:</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POQ, XXVI, p. 293.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. +Day-Care Centers/1969:</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
AIPO, July 1969: "Federal funds for day-care centers?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIVIL RIGHTS

Issue No.*/Issue/Year

41. +Gun Ban for Minors/1967: "Prohibit the sale of handguns to any person under 21, and the sale of rifles and shotguns to those under 18."

HC  H  SC  S  CQ, XXIII, p. 169.
h   h

AIPO, 27 August 1967: "Which of these three plans would you prefer for the use of guns by persons under the age of 18 — forbid their use completely, put strict restrictions on their use, or continue as at present with few restrictions?"

Forbid  Strict Restrictions  Continue as Now  No Opinion
31%  53%  14%  2%

Difference = 36%
GPI, No. 27, p. 18.

42. +Universal Gun Licensing/1968: "Require the licensing of all owners of firearms."

HC  H  SC  S  CQ, XXIV, p. 105.
n   n   n   n

AIPO, August 1967: "Would you favor or oppose a law which would require a person to obtain a police permit before he or she could buy a gun?"

Favor  Oppose  No Opinion  Difference = 49%
73%  24%  3%
Polls, III, No. 3, p. 82.

43. +School Integration/1963: "Permit the Attorney General to initiate suits against local public schools boards or public colleges on written receipt of a complaint of existing segregation, if complainant is unable to do so himself, and if he determines that such a suit would further the orderly progress of desegregation in public education."

HC  H  SC  S  CQ, XIX, p. 90.
y   h

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
Issue No.*/Issue/Year

**Harris, October 1963:** "Should the law guarantee Negroes equal rights to white people integrated schooling?"

- Yes, whites nationwide
  - 75%
- Difference = 50% - 75%

**POQ, XXXI, p. 486.**

**44. Open Housing/1966:** "Enact legislation to prohibit discrimination on the basis of race or religion in the sale, rental or financing of all dwelling units by owners, brokers and lending corporation."

**HC H SC S**

- Average Difference = 13%
**y y h n**

**CQ, XXII, p. 109.**

**ORCP, September 1966:** "Would you be for or against new Federal laws to prevent discrimination against Negroes in housing?"

- For
  - 30%
- Against
  - 54%
- No Opinion
  - 16%

(Whites) **Difference = 24%**

**Polls, III, 4, p. 91.**

**Harris, 10 October 1966:** "Attitudes toward open-housing law."

- Favor
  - 49%
- Oppose
  - 51%

(Whites) **Difference = 2%**

**POQ, XXXI, p. 491.**

**45. Open Housing/1967:** "Authorize the Attorney General to support enforcement efforts in the prohibition of housing discrimination when he has reason to believe that a general pattern or practice of discrimination exists." (Civil Rights Message, 15 February 1967).

**HC H SC S**

- Average Difference = 19.5%
**h**

**CQ, XXIII, p. 168.**

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.*
CIVIL RIGHTS (Continued)

Issue No.*/Issue/Year

ORCP, June 1967: Favor new open housing laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Whites)

AIPO, 29 March 1967: "Of 58% who knew what 'open housing' meant: Would you like to see Congress pass an 'open housing' bill or reject it?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POQ, XXXI, p. 491.

46. +Open Housing/1967: "Prohibit, in 1968, discrimination in (1) the sale or rental of housing by persons who do not occupy the housing, and (2) all housing for five or more families."

HC H SC S

h

CQ, XXIII, p. 167.

AIPO, 29 March 1967: "Would you like to see Congress pass an 'open housing' bill or reject it?" — asked of those knowing the meaning of open housing = 58%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GPI, No. 22, p. 15.

47. +Open Housing/1967: "Prohibit discrimination in the sale and rental of all housing in 1969."

HC H S SC

h

CQ, XXIII, p. 167.

AIPO, April 1967: "Would you like to see Congress pass an 'open housing' bill or reject it?" — asked of those knowing the meaning of open housing = 58%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POQ, XXXI, p. 491.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
CIVIL RIGHTS (Continued)

**Issue No.*/Issue/Year**

48. **Open Housing Enforcement/1967**: "Authorize the Secretary (of Housing and Urban Development) to issue cease-and-desist order if a voluntary solution is not found."

   HCHSCS \[CQ, XXIII, p. 168.\]

   ORCP, 17 May-10 June 1967: "Would you be for or against new Federal laws to prevent discrimination against Negroes in housing?"

   For Against No Opinion Difference = 20%
   31% 51% 18% (Whites) \[Polls, III, p. 91.\]

49. **Open Housing Financing/1968**: "Appropriate $11.1 million in fiscal 1969 funds to administer the fair housing provisions of the 1968 Civil Rights Act."

   HCHSCSY \[CQ, XXIV, p. 105.\]

   Harris, 5 June 1967: "Attitudes toward open-housing law."

   Favor Oppose Difference = 26%
   37% 63% (Whites) \[POQ, XXXI, p. 491.\]

50. **Voting Rights/1963**: "Prohibit the application, by state or local officials, of different tests, standards, practices or procedures for different applicants seeking to register in a federal election."

   HCHSCSY \[CQ, XIX, p. 90.\]

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.*
### CIVIL RIGHTS (Continued)

**Issue No.* / Issue / Year**

Harris, October 1963: "Should the law guarantee Negroes equal rights to white people in voting?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No and No Opinion</th>
<th>Difference = 90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>(Whites) POQ, XXXI, p. 486.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. Wiretap/1968: "Repeal provisions of the Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (Title III) which permitted eavesdropping and wiretapping by federal, state and local authorities in a variety of situations."

Harris, 1969: "Increase power for federal government to tap telephones."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Difference = 48%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Life, op. loc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


AIPO, 16 January 1949: "One of Truman's proposal concerns unemployment practices. How far do you yourself think the Federal government should go in requiring employers to hire people without regard to their race, religion, color, or nationality?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All the Way</th>
<th>Part of the Way</th>
<th>None of the Way</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 18%  
POQ, XXXII, p. 146.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.*
AIPO, 29 April 1949: "How far do you yourself think the Federal government should go in requiring employers to hire people without regard to race, religion, color, or nationality?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All the Way</th>
<th>None of the Way</th>
<th>Leave to States</th>
<th>Depends/No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 13%

POQ, XXXII, p. 146.

53. +Equal Employment/1963: "Establish a federal Fair Employment Practices Commission and make it applicable to both employees and unions."

HC H SC S

CQ, XIX, p. 90.

Harris, October 1963: "Should the law guarantee Negroes equal rights to white people in job opportunities?"

Yes, Whites, nationwide Difference = 60%-80%

POQ, XXXI, p. 486.

54. +Anti-Discrimination, Employment/1968: "Empower the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to issue, after an appropriate hearing, an order requiring an offending employer or union to cease its discriminating practices and to take corrective action."

HC H SC S

CQ, XXIV, p. 105.

ORCP, 17 May-10 June 1967: "In dealing with unions, do you think government agencies should get tougher in requiring them to accept Negroes as members, or are unions doing enough now?"

Get Tougther Doing Enough Now No Opinion

19% 53% 28% (Whites)

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
"Do you think government should be tougher in requiring companies to hire Negroes, or are companies doing enough now?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Get Tougher</th>
<th>Doing Enough Now</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Whites)

Average Difference = 45%

Polls, III, p. 90.

55. +Public Accomodations/1963: "The Senate Commerce Committee, to which the public accomodations section (Title II) had been referred as a separate bill, October 8 approved a bill incorporating the Administration's request. For reasons of strategy, it was not formally reported."

"Guarantee all citizens equal access to the services and facilities of hotels, restaurants, places of amusement and retail establishments."

HC  H  SC  S
y   y
h   h

AIPO, 10 September 1963: "How would you feel about a law which would give all persons — Negro as well as white — the right to be served in public places such as hotels, restaurants, theaters, and similar establishments. Would you like to see Congress pass such a law, or not?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 16%

Polls, I, 1, p. 51.


HC  H  SC  S
y   y
h   h  n

CQ, XII, p. 109.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.*
CIVIL RIGHTS (Continued)

Issue No.*/Issue/Year

AIPO, Aug. 1966: "Administration pushing integration too fast?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too Fast</th>
<th>Too Slow</th>
<th>About Right</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 17%

GPI, No. 17.

57. -Voting Age/1954: "Propose 18-year-old suffrage."

AIPO, March 1954: "Do you think that persons 18, 19, and 20 years old should be permitted to vote, or not?"

Yes No, No Opinion
58% 52%

Difference = 16%-58%

Polls, III, p. 73.

58. -Voting Age/1955: "Propose lower voting age."

AIPO, March 1954: "Do you think that persons 18, 19, and 20 years old should be permitted to vote, or not?"

Yes No, No Opinion
58% 42%

Difference = 16%-58%

Polls, III, 1, 1. 73.

59. -Voting Age/1968: "President Johnson, June 27, asked Congress to approve and submit for ratification by three quarters of the state legislatures an amendment to the Constitution to lower the minimum voting age to 18."

HC H SC S
h

CQ, XXIV, p. 490.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
CIVIL RIGHTS (Continued)

Issue No. */Issue/Year

AIPO, March 1967: "Do you think that persons 18, 19, and 20 years old should be permitted to vote, or not?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Difference = 31%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>GPI, No. 22, p. 13.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


AIPO, 6 August 1949: "At present, people who live in Washington, D.C. cannot vote for their city officials since they are appointed by the President of the United States. Do you think the people of Washington should elect their city officials — or should they continue to be appointed by the President?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizens Elect</th>
<th>Appointed</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 45%
PONS, 6 August 1949.


AIPO, 27 February 1954: "At present, people whose permanent home is in Washington, D.C. cannot vote in national elections. Do you think this should be changed so they can vote in national elections?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should be changed</th>
<th>Should not</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 68%
PONS, 27 February 1957.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
CIVIL RIGHTS (Continued)

Issue No. */Issue/Year


   HC H SC S

   Favor Oppose No Opinion Difference = 56%
   66% 10% 24%

Harris, September 1963: "Home rule for D.C. (voters only)."


   HC H SC S

   Favor Oppose Not Sure Difference = 56%
   66% 10% 24%

Harris, 23 September 1965: "As you know, the city of Washington, D.C., can vote in Presidential elections, but it does not elect its own Government. Congress is soon going to vote on whether or not to give the city of Washington home rule. Would you favor or oppose home rule for Washington, D.C. ?"

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
ELECTORAL REFORM

Issue No.* / Issue / Year

64. +Campaign Expenditure Regulation/1966: "Limit campaign contributions to each candidate and the committees working on his behalf to no more than $5,000 from a single source in any calendar year."

HC    SC     S
h      n

CQ, XXII, p. 110.

AIPO, 1966: "Would you favor or oppose a law which would put a limit on the total amount of money which can be spent for ... a candidate in his campaign for public office?"

Favor Oppose No Opinion Difference = 54%
72%  18%  10% Polls, III, p. 79.

65. -Campaign Regulation Ceiling: "Repeal all existing ceilings on total expenditures of candidates for federal offices."

HC    SC     S
h      n

CQ, XXII, p. 110.

AIPO, 1966: "Would you favor or oppose a law which would put a limit on the total amount of money which can be spent ... by a candidate in his campaign for public office?"

Favor Oppose No Opinion Difference = 54%
72%  18%  10% Polls, III, No. 3, p. 79.

66. -Limit Campaign Contributions/1967: "Limit total campaign contributions of any individual to any single candidate to $5,000."

HC    SC     S
h      y      y

CQ, XXIII, p. 171.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
ELECTORAL REFORM (Continued)

Issue No.*/Issue/Year

AIPO, June 1967: "Would you favor or oppose a law which would put a limit on the total amount of money which can be spent for...a candidate in his campaign for public office?"

Favor Oppose No Opinion Difference = 57%
75% 16% 11%  
Polls, III, p. 79.

67. Campaign Expenditure Ceiling/1967: "Repeal the arbitrary limits on the total permissible expenditures of candidates for federal office."

HC H SC S  
hy y CQ, XXIII, p. 171.

AIPO, June 1967: "Would you favor or oppose a law which would put a limit on the total amount of money which can be spent...by a candidate in his campaign for office?"

Favor Oppose No Opinion Difference = 57%
73% 16% 11%  
Polls, III, No. 3, p. 79.

68. Campaign Contribution Regulation/1967: "Prohibit corporations which have contacts with the federal government from contributing to state and local election campaigns."

HC H SC S  
hy y CQ, XXIII, p. 171.

AIPO, August 1966: "Should corporations be allowed to make campaign contributions?"

Yes No No Opinion Difference = 29%
27% 56% 17%  
GPI, No. 14.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
**ELECTORAL REFORM (Continued)**

**Issue No.*/Issue/Year**

69. **Campaign Contribution Regulation/1968:** "An Administration-backed bill (HR 11233) to provide comprehensive changes in political campaign reporting requirements..."

- **HC** H SC S
- **CQ, XXIV, p. 659.**

**AIPO, 1968:** Limit campaign spending.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70. **Electoral Reform/1969:** "Adopt the direct election approach to electoral reform."

- **HC** H SC S
- **CQ, XXV, p. 122.**

**AIPO, November 1968:** "Amend the Constitution to abolish the Electoral College, and replace it with direct election."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71. **House Terms/1966:** "Amend the Constitution to provide a four-year term of office for members of the House of Representatives."

- **HC** H SC S
- **CQ, XXII, p. 107.**

**AIPO, 13 January 1966:** "How would you feel about changing the terms of members of the House of Representatives from 2 years to 4 years. Would you favor or oppose this?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.*
TAX AND ECONOMIC POLICY

Issue No.*/Issue/Year

72.  -Personal Income Tax/1947:  HR 1  "An act to reduce individual income tax payments."

HC H SC S President       CQ, III, p. 376.
                  y       y  veto

AIPO, 29 March 1947:  "Do you consider the amount of income tax which you have to pay as too high, too low, or about right?"  Asked of income tax payers only.

Too high  Too low  About right  No Opinion
54%   0%  40%   6%

Difference = 14%

POQ, XXVIII, p. 161.

73.  -Personal Income Tax/1948:  "Income tax reduction"  HR 4790.

HC H SC S President       CQ, IV, p. 51.
                  y       y       y     y  veto

AIPO, 27 March 1949:  "Do you consider the amount of income tax which you have to pay as too high, too low, or about right?"

Too high  Too low  About Right  No Opinion
57%  1%  38%   4%

Difference = 19%

POQ, XXVII, p. 161.

74.  -Personal Income Tax/1963:  "Reduce personal income tax rates for 1963 to a range of 18.5 percent to 84.5 percent, with a corresponding drop in the withholding rate."

HC H SC S       CQ, XIX, p. 92.
                  n       n       n     h

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
Issue No.*/Issue/Year

AIPO, 29 September 1963: "Have you heard or read about the Kennedy proposal to reduce income taxes?" Those who were informed were asked: "How do you, yourself, feel? Do you favor or oppose a cut in income taxes now?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor cut</th>
<th>Oppose cut</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Difference = 31%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POQ, XXVIII, p. 164.

75. Personal Income Tax/1957: "Continue income taxes at existing rates."

HC H SC S

CQ, XIII, p. 92.

AIPO, 24 April 1957: "Do you consider the amount of personal income tax you have to pay as too high, too low, or about right?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too high</th>
<th>Too low</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Difference = 30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POQ, XXVIII, p. 161.

76. Personal Income Tax/1960: "Tax as ordinary income any gain realized by the sale of depreciable personal property, to the extent of the depreciation deduction previously taken on the property."

HC H SC S

CQ, XVI, p. 98.

AIPO, 15 April 1959: "Do you consider the amount of personal income tax you have to pay as too high, too low, or about right?"

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
TAX AND ECONOMIC POLICY (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No.*</th>
<th>Issue/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too high</td>
<td>Too low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference = 90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POQ, XXVIII, p. 161.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

77. **Personal Income Tax/1963:** "Reduce personal income tax rates for all of 1964 to a range of 15.5 percent to 71.5 percent, with a drop in the withholding rate to 13.5 percent effective July 1, 1964."

HC H SC S CQ, XIX, p. 92.

AIPO, 29 September 1963: "Have you heard or read about the Kennedy proposal to reduce income taxes?" Those who were informed were asked: "How do you, yourself feel? Do you favor or oppose a cut in income taxes now?"

Favor cut Oppose cut No opinion Difference = 31%
60% 29% 11% POQ, XXVII, p. 164.

78. **Personal Income Tax/1965:** "Strengthen the system by increasing the amount of wages subject to taxation and increasing the amount of the tax."

HC H SC S Average Difference = 80%
CQ, XXI, p. 111.

AIPO, 11 May 1966: "How do you, yourself, feel — would you favor or oppose an income tax increase at this time?"

Favor Oppose No Opinion Difference = 60%
16% 76% 8% Polls, II, No. 2, p. 86.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.*
TAX AND ECONOMIC POLICY (Continued)

Issue No.*/Issue/Year

AIPO, 15 April 1966: "Do you consider the amount of Federal income tax which you have to pay as too high, about right, or too low?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too high</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>Too low</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 100%

Polls, II, No. 2, p. 82.


HC   SC   S
h

Average Difference = 52%

CQ, XXIII, p. 174.

AIPO, January 1967: "President Johnson has asked Congress to pass a bill that would increase personal income taxes. If passed, it would mean that for every $100 now paid in income taxes, there would be an additional 10 percent surcharge, or $10. Would you like to see Congress pass this bill or reject it?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 54%

Polls, III, No. 4, p. 77.

AIPO, July 1967: "The suggestion has been made that income taxes be increased to help pay for the war in Vietnam. Would you favor or oppose an income tax increase for this purpose?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 50%

Polls, III, No. 3, p. 81.

80. +Tax Surcharge/1967: "Impose a 10 percent surcharge on income tax liabilities of individuals."

HC   H   SC   S
h

Average = 62%

CQ, XXIII, p. 174.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
ORCP, 7-11 October 1966: "If something must be done to halt inflation — would you favor raising federal income taxes or would you favor cutting down federal government spending?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise taxes</th>
<th>Cut spending</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 72%
Polls, II, 4, p. 77.

ORCP, 7-11 October 1966: "As a way to control inflation — would you favor or oppose raising personal income taxes?"
Sample = 2,043. Telephone, nationwide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Difference = 62%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Polls, II, 4, p. 77.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AIPO, 23 November 1966: "The suggestion has been made that income taxes be increased to help pay for the war in Vietnam — would you favor or oppose an income tax increase for this purpose?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Difference = 54%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Polls, II, 4, p. 71.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AIPO, May 1966: "Increase in income taxes."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Difference = 60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81. +Revenue Sharing/1969: "Enact a revenue-sharing plan to return percentage of personal income tax to states on basis of each state's share of national population, adjusted of the state's revenue effort."

HC H SC S
h
CQ, XXV, p. 119.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
TAX AND ECONOMIC POLICY (Continued)

**Issue No. */Issue*/Year**

Harris, 1969: "Giving any surplus funds which the federal government may have after the war in Vietnam to the states according to a fair formula."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Life, loc. cit.

82. +Defense Spending/1968: "Congress (Oct. 11)... completed action on... (HR 18707) appropriating $71,869,828,000 for the Department of Defense in fiscal 1969... As enacted, HR 18707 was $5,204,172,000 under the Administration's request."

HC H SC S

CQ, XXIV, p. 577.

AIPO, July 1969: "There is much discussion as to the amount of money the government in Washington should spend for national defense and military purposes. How do you feel about this: so you think we are spending too little, too much, or about the right amount?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too little</th>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>Right amount</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference = 76%

GPI, No. 50, p. 11.


HC H SC S

CQ, XXV, p. 455.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.*
TAX AND ECONOMIC POLICY (Continued)

Issue No. */Issue/Year


Too little  Too much  About right  No opinion
8%  52%  31%  9%
 Difference = 14%
GPI, No. 50, p. 11.

84. Space Appropriations/1967: "Congress appropriated (HR 12474) $4.6 billion for space program for fiscal year 1968. It was a cut of $511 million from the request, largest cut to date, first time space appropriation fell below $5 billion since 1962."

HC  H  SC  S  CQ, XXIII, p. 83.
y  y  y  y

AIPO, March 1967: Important to beat Russia to the moon.

Yes  No  No opinion  Difference = 27%
33%  60%  7%  GPI, No. 22, p. 19.

85. Space Appropriations/1969: "Fiscal year 1970 appropriation for space research and technology = $3.9 billion, or cut of $300 million from fiscal year 1969, lowest appropriation since fiscal year 1963."

HC  H  SC  S  CQ, XXV, p. 92.
y  y  y  y

AIPO, February 1969: Increase funds for space research?

Increase  Same  Reduce  No opinion  Difference = 15%
14%  41%  40%  5%  GPI, No. 45, p. 17.

86. National Debt Limit/1953: "Increase national debt limit."

HC  H  SC  S  Average Difference = 38.3%
y  y  y  h  CQ, IX, p. 89.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
TAX AND ECONOMIC POLICY (Continued)

**Issue No.*/Issue/Year**

**AIPO, 6 February 1953:** "If the new Congress finds that it cannot balance the budget for this year and at the same time reduce income taxes, which do you think it should try to do first?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cut taxes</th>
<th>Balance budget</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Difference = 41%**

POQ, XXVIII, p. 162.

**AIPO, 27 March 1953:** "Some members of Congress argue that federal income taxes should be cut 10 percent beginning this July 1. Others argue that income taxes should not be cut until the budget is balanced. With which side do you agree?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cut taxes</th>
<th>Balance budget</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Difference = 44%**

POQ, XXVIII, p. 163.

**AIPO, 21 June 1953:** "Some members of Congress say that federal income taxes should be cut beginning in July. Others say that income taxes should not be cut until January to help balance the budget. With which side do you agree?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cut taxes</th>
<th>Balance budget</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Difference = 30%**

POQ, XXVIII, p. 163.

87. **Price & Wage Control/1951:** "Strengthen wage and price controls."

HC H SC S CQ, VII, p. 67.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.*
TAX AND ECONOMIC POLICY (Continued)

Issue No.*/Issue/Year

AIPO, 15 November 1950: "It has been suggested that both prices and wages (salaries) should be "frozen" — that is, kept from going any higher. This means that wages couldn't go up and prices couldn't go up. Do you think this is a good idea or a poor idea?"

Good  Fair  Poor  No opinion  Difference = 33%

63%  8%  22%  7%  POQ, XV, p. 179.

88.   +Increase Postal Rates/1957: "Raise postal rates to increase revenues by $641 million a year."

HC  H  SC  S  CQ, XIII, p. 91.

y  y  h

AIPO, 3 March 1957: "The proposal, which the U.S. Post Office Department has under consideration, to boost the first-class mail from the present three cents to five cents . . . . To help put the U.S. Post Office Department on a paying basis, would you favor or oppose increasing the rate from 3 to 5 cents?"

Favor  Oppose  No opinion  Difference = 54%

20%  74%  6%  PONS, 3 March 1957.

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and E.
APPENDIX C

THE GALLUP DESIGN OF THE SAMPLE*

DESIGN OF THE SAMPLE

The design of the sample is that of a replicated probability sample down to the block level in the case of urban areas and to segments of townships in the case of rural areas.

After stratifying the nation geographically and by size of community in order to insure conformity of the sample with the latest available estimates by the Census Bureau of the distribution of the adult population, about 320 different sampling locations or areas were selected on a strictly random basis. The interviewers had no choice whatsoever concerning the part of the city or county in which they conducted their interviews.

Approximately 5 interviews were conducted in each such randomly selected sampling point. Interviewers were given maps of the area to which they were assigned, with a starting point indicated, and required to follow a specified direction. At each occupied dwelling unit, interviewers were instructed to select respondents by following a prescribed systematic method and by a male-female assignment. This procedure was followed until the assigned number of interviews was completed.

Since this sampling procedure is designed to produce a sample which approximates the adult civilian population (21 and older) living in private households in the U.S. (that is, excluding those in prisons and hospitals, hotels, religious and educational institutions, and on military reservations), the survey results can be applied to this population for the purpose of projecting percentages into number of people. The manner in which the sample is drawn also produces a sample which approximates the population of private households in the United States. Therefore, survey results can also be projected in terms of number of households when appropriate.

SAMPLING TOLERANCES

In interpreting survey results, it should be borne in mind that all sample surveys are subject to sampling error, that is, the extent to which the results may differ from what would be obtained if the whole population surveyed had been interviewed. The size of such sampling errors depends largely on the number of interviews.

The following tables may be used in estimating the sampling error of any percentage in this report. The computed allowances have taken into account the effect of the sample design upon sampling error. They may be interpreted as indicating the range (plus or minus the figure shown) within which the results of repeated samplings in the same time period could be expected to vary, 95 per cent of the time, assuming the same sampling procedure, the same interviewers, and the same questionnaire.

Table A shows how much allowance should be made for the sampling error of a percentage.

The table would be used in the following manner: Let us say a reported percentage is 33 for a group which includes 1500 respondents. Then we go to row "percentages near 30" in the table and go across to the column headed "1500." The number at this point is 3, which means that the 33 per cent obtained in the sample is subject to a sampling error of plus or minus 3 points. Another way of saying it is that very probably (95 chances out of 100) the average of repeated samplings would be somewhere between 30 and 36, with the most likely figure the 33 obtained.

In comparing survey results in two samples, such as men and women, the question arises as to how large a difference between them be before one can be reasonably sure that it reflects a real difference. In tables B and C, the number of points which must be allowed for, is such comparisons, is indicated.

Two tables are provided. One is for percentages near 20 or 80; the other for percentages near 50. For percentages in between, the error to be allowed for is between that shown in the two tables.

Here is an example of how the tables would be used: Let us say that 50 per cent of men respond a certain way and 40 per cent of women respond that way also, for a difference of 10 percentage points between them. Can we say with any assurance that the 10-point difference reflects a real difference between men and women on the question? The sample contains approximately 750 men and 750 women.

Since the percentages are near 50, we consult Table B, and since the two samples are about 750 persons each, we look for the number in the column headed "750" which is also in the row designated "750." We find the number 6 here. This means that the allowance for
error should be 6 points, and that in concluding that
the percentage among men is somewhere between 4
and 16 points higher than the percentage among wo­
men we should be wrong only about 5 per cent of the
time. In other words, we can conclude with con­
siderable confidence that a difference exists in the
direction observed and that it amounts to at least 4
percentage points.

If, in another case, men's responses amount to 22 per
cent, say, and women's 24 per cent, we consult Table
B because these percentages are near 20. We look in
the column headed "750" and see that the number is
5. Obviously, then, the 2-point difference is inconclu­
sive.

TABLE A

Recommended Allowance for Sampling Error of a Percentage

In Percentage Points
(at 95 in 100 confidence level)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>1500</th>
<th>1000</th>
<th>750</th>
<th>600</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages near 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages near 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages near 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages near 40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages near 50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages near 60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages near 70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages near 80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages near 90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The chances are 95 in 100 that the sampling error is not larger than the figures shown.

TABLE B

Recommended Allowance for Sampling Error of the Difference

In Percentage Points
(at 95 in 100 confidence level)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages near 20 or percentages near 80</th>
<th>750</th>
<th>600</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of the Sample</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE C

Percentages near 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages near 50</th>
<th>750</th>
<th>600</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of the Sample</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The chances are 95 in 100 that the sampling error is not larger than the figures shown.
APPENDIX D

HOW THE BOXSCORE WORKS*

"The items tabulated in the Boxscore included only the specific legislative requests contained in the President's messages to Congress and other public statements.

"Excluded from the Boxscore are proposals advocated by the Executive Branch officials, but not specifically by the President; measures endorsed by the President but not requested by him; nominations; and suggestions that Congress consider or study particular topics, when legislative action is not requested.

"Routine appropriation requests, which provide funds for regular continuing Government operations, are excluded. Appropriation requests for specific programs, however, which the President indicated in special messages or other communications were important in his over-all legislative program, are included.

"Since the Boxscore fundamentally is a tabular checklist of the President's program, presented in neither greater nor less detail than is found in Presidential messages, the individual requests necessarily differ considerably from one another in their scope and importance."

### APPENDIX E

84 POLL DIFFERENCE-PUBLIC ISSUE PAIRS RANKED
ACCORDING TO THE MAGNITUDE OF THE DIFFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No.*/</th>
<th>Poll Difference</th>
<th>Congress (C) or Presidents (P) Agreeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>26/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>27/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>15/P; 44/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>72/C; 83/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/P; 85/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>52/C; 55/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/P; 16/P; 56/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/P; 46/C; 47/C; 73/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>45/C; 48/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>36/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll Difference</th>
<th>Issue no.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>49/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>2/P; 84/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>31/P; 33/P; 39/C; 68/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>75/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>34/P; 59/P; 74/P; 77/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>25/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>87/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>40/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>41/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>38/P; 71/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>51/P; 86/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>3/P; 6/P; 32/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>1/P; 29/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll Difference %</th>
<th>Issue No.*/ Congress (C) or Presidents (P) Agreeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>69/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>13/P; 28/P; 54/C; 60/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>37/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>81/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>19/P; 42/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>9/C; 20/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>79/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>64/P; 65/P; 88/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>8/P; 62/P; 63/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>5/P; 18/P; 66/P; 67/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>53/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>30/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>80/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll Difference</th>
<th>Congress (C) or Presidents (P) Agreeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>14/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>61/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>70/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>23/C; 24/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>82/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>10/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>21/C; 22/C; 78/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Number corresponds to numbered issues in Appendices A and B.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll Difference %</th>
<th>Congress (C) or Presidents (P) Agreeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>35/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>17/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>50/P; 76/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

RECORD OF GALLUP POLL ACCURACY*

### RECORD OF GALLUP POLL ACCURACY
(17 Elections — 1936 to 1968)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gallup Final Survey</th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Error on Winning Candidate, Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>55.7 Roosevelt</td>
<td>62.5 Roosevelt</td>
<td>-6.8 Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>54.0 Democratic</td>
<td>50.8 Democratic</td>
<td>+3.2 Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>52.0 Roosevelt</td>
<td>55.0 Roosevelt</td>
<td>-3.0 Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>52.0 Democratic</td>
<td>48.0 Democratic</td>
<td>+4.0 Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>51.5 Roosevelt</td>
<td>53.3 Roosevelt</td>
<td>-1.8 Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>58.0 Republican</td>
<td>54.3 Republican</td>
<td>+3.7 Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>44.5 Truman</td>
<td>49.9 Truman</td>
<td>-5.4 Truman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>51.0 Democratic</td>
<td>50.3 Democratic</td>
<td>+0.7 Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>51.0 Eisenhower</td>
<td>55.4 Eisenhower</td>
<td>-4.4 Eisenhower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>51.5 Democratic</td>
<td>52.7 Democratic</td>
<td>-1.2 Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>59.5 Eisenhower</td>
<td>57.8 Eisenhower</td>
<td>+1.7 Eisenhower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>57.0 Democratic</td>
<td>56.5 Democratic</td>
<td>+0.5 Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>51.0 Kennedy</td>
<td>50.1 Kennedy</td>
<td>+0.9 Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>55.5 Democratic</td>
<td>52.7 Democratic</td>
<td>+2.8 Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>64.0 Johnson</td>
<td>61.3 Johnson</td>
<td>+2.7 Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>52.5 Democratic</td>
<td>51.9 Democratic</td>
<td>+0.6 Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>43.0 Nixon</td>
<td>43.5 Nixon</td>
<td>-0.5 Nixon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Deviation for seventeen national elections, percentage points = 2.6

Average Deviation for seven national elections through 1948, percentage points = 3.9

Average Deviation for ten national elections since 1948, percentage points = 1.4

In every instance, these figures were published the Sunday before the Tuesday election.
Copies of the final release in each case can be obtained for a small charge for the photostat.

---

1. Average error on major party candidates = 6.6 percentage points.
2. Final report said Democrats would win control of the House, which they did even though the Republicans won a majority of the popular vote.
3. Civilian vote 53.3, Roosevelt soldier vote .5 = 53.8 Roosevelt. Gallup final survey based on civilian vote.
4. Average error on major party candidates = 4.8 percentage points.
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